arXiv:1107.4625v2 [math.LO] 23 Jun 2012

PSEUDO PCF

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We continue our investigation on pcf with weak form of choice. Characteristically we assume DC + $\mathscr{P}(Y)$ when looking and $\prod\limits_{s\in Y}\delta_s$. We get more parallel of theorems on pcf.

Anotated Content

§0 Introduction, pg.2

§1 On pseudo true cofinality, pg.4

[We continue [Sh:938, §5] to try to generalize the pcf theory for $\aleph_1$-complete filters D on Y assuming only DC + $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$. So is similar to [Sh:b, ChXII]. We suggest to replace cofinality by pseudo cofinality. In particular we get the existence of a sequence of generators, get a bound to Reg $\cap$ $\mathrm{pp}(\mu)\backslash\mu_0$ using the size of Reg $\cap\mu\backslash\mu_0$ using a no-hole claim and existence of lub (unlike [Sh:835]).

§2 Composition and generating sequences for pseudo pcf, pg.14

[We deal with pseudo true cofinality of $\prod\limits_{i\in Z}\prod\limits_{j\in Y_i}\lambda_{i,j}$ and below also in the degenerated case each $\langle\lambda_{i,j} : j\in Y_i\rangle$ is constant. We then use it to clarify the state of generating sequences; see 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.12, 2.13.

§3 Measuring Reduced products, pg.23

§(3A) On ps-$\mathbf{T}_D(g)$

[We get that several measures of ${}^\kappa\mu/D$ are essentially equal.]

§(3B) Depth of reduced power of ordinals, pg.26

[Using the independence property for a sequence of filters we can bound the relevant depth. This generalizes [Sh:460] or really [Sh:513, §3].]

§(3C) Bounds on the Depth

Date: November 6, 2011.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* MSC 2010: Primary 03E04, 03E25.

Key words and phrases. set theory, pcf, axiom of choice.

The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Partially supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (Grant No. 2006108). Part of this work was done during the author's visit to Mittag-Leffler Institute, Djursholm, Sweden. He thanks the Institute for hospitality and support, Publication 955.

[We start by basic properties by No-Hole Claim (1.12(1)) and dependence of $\bar{\alpha}/D$ only (3.21). We give a bound for $\lambda^{+\alpha(1)}/D$ (in Theorem 3.22, 3.24).]

§(3D) Concluding Remarks

[Comments to [Sh:938].]

§4 On RGCH with Little Choice

§ 0. INTRODUCTION

In the first section we deal with generalizing the pcf theory in the direction started in [Sh:938, §5] trying to understand pseudo true cofinality of small products of regular cardinals. The difference with earlier works is that here we assume $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{U}}$ for any set $\mathscr{U}$ of power $\le |\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(Y))|$ or actually working harder, just $\le |\mathscr{P}(Y)|$ when analyzing $\prod\limits_{t \in Y} \alpha_t$, whereas in [Sh:497] we assumed $\mathrm{AC}_{\sup\{\alpha_t : t \in Y\}}$ and in [Sh:835] we have (in addition to $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(Y))}$) assumptions like "${}^\omega(\sup\{\alpha_t : t \in Y\})$ is well ordered". In [Sh:938, §1-§4] we assume only $\mathrm{AC}_{<\mu} + DC$ and consider $\aleph_1$-complete filters on μ but in the characteristic case μ is a limit of measurable cardinals.

Note that generally in this work, though we try occasionally not to use DC, it will not be a real loss to assume it all the time. More specifically, we prove the existence of a minimal $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $\lambda =$ ps-tcf$(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ assuming $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ and (of course DC and) α_t of large enough cofinality. We then prove the existence of $X \subseteq Y$ such that $J^{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}_{\le\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}] = J^{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}] + X$, see 1.5 and even (in 1.7) the parallel of existence a a $<_{D_1}$-lub for an $<_D$-increasing sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, generalize the no-hole claim 1.12, and give a bound on pp for non-fix points (1.10).

In §2 we further investigate true cofinality. In Claim 2.2, assuming AC_λ and D an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y, we start from ps-tcf$(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$, dividing by $\mathrm{eq}(\bar{\alpha}) = \{(s,t) : \alpha_s = \alpha_t\}$. We also prove the composition Theorem 2.6: when ps-tcf$(\prod\limits_i$ ps-tcf$(\prod\limits_j \lambda_{i,j}, <_{D_i}), <_E)$ is ps-tcf$(\prod\limits_{(i,j)} \lambda_{i,j}, <_D)$.

We then prove the pcf closure conclusion: giving a sufficient condition for the operation $\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}$ to be idempotent. Lastly, we revisit the generating sequence.

In §(3A) we measure $\prod\limits_{t \in Y} g(t)$ for $g \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Ord}\backslash\{0\})$ in three ways and show they are almost equal in 1.13. The price is that we replace (true) cofinality by pseudo (true) cofinality, which is inevitable.

In §(3B) we prove a relative of [Sh:513, §3]; again dealing with depth (instead of rank as in [Sh:938]) adding some information even under ZFC. Assuming that the sequence $\langle D_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of filters has the independence property (IND), see Definition 3.12, with D_n a filter on Y_n we can bound the depth of ${}^{(Y_n)}\zeta$ by ζ, for every ζ for many n's, see 3.13. Of course, we can generalize this to $\langle D_s : s \in S \rangle$. This is incomparable with the results of [Sh:938, §4]; also we add some cases to [Sh:938, §4].

Note that the assumptions like $\mathrm{IND}(\bar{D})$ are complimentary to ones used in [Sh:835] to get considerable information. Our original hope was to arrive to a dichotomy. The first possibility will say that one of the versions of an axiom suggested in [Sh:835] holds, which means "for some suitable algebra", there is no independent ω-sequence; in this case [Sh:835] tells us much. The second possibility will be a case of IND, and then we try to show that there is a rank system in the sense of [Sh:938]. But presently for this we need too much choice. The dichotomy we succeed to prove is with small o-Depth in one side, the results of [Sh:835] on the other side. It would be better to have ps-o-Depth in the first side. We try to sort out the "almost equal" in 3.5 - 3.7.

Question 0.1. $[\mathrm{DC} + \mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}]$

Assume

- (a) $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y$ Ord
- (b) $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)$ for every $t \in Y$
- (c) $\lambda_t \in$ $\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ for $t \in Z$, in fact, $\lambda_t =$ ps-tcf$(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_t}), D_t$ is a $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y
- (d) $\lambda =$ ps-tcf$_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\langle\lambda_t : t \in Z\rangle$
- (e) (a possible help) $X_t \in D_t, \langle X_t : t \in Y\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint.

(A) Now does $\lambda \in$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$? Can we say something on D_λ from [Sh:938, 5.9] improved in 1.2

(B) At least when trying to generalize the RGCH, see [Sh:460] and [Sh:829].

§ 1. ON PSEUDO TRUE COFINALITY

We continue [Sh:938, §5].

Below we give an improvement of [Sh:938, 5.19], omitting DC from the assumptions but first we observe

Claim 1.1. *Assume* AC_Z.
1) We have $\theta \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$ *when* $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_t : t \in Y \rangle$ *and* $\theta \in \text{ps-pcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha})$ *and* $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$.
2) We have $\mathrm{cf}(\mathrm{rk}_D(\bar{\alpha}))) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$ *when* $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_t : t \in Y \rangle, t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$.

Proof. Clearly θ is a regular cardinal.
1) If we have AC_α for every $\alpha < \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$ then we can use [Sh:938, 5.7(4)] but we do not assume this. In general let D be an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y such that $\theta = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$, exists as we are assuming $\theta \in \text{ps-pcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha})$. Let $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \theta \rangle$ witness $\theta = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$, i.e. as in [Sh:938, 5.6(2)] note as $t \in Y \Rightarrow \alpha_t > 0$, we are assuming $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$; also we can assume $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for every $\alpha < \theta$.

Toward contradiction assume $\theta := \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$. As $\theta < \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$, there is a function h from Z onto θ, so the sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_{h(z)} : z \in Z \rangle$ is well defined. As we are assuming AC_Z, there is a sequence $\langle f_z : z \in Z \rangle$ such that $f_z \in \mathscr{F}_{h(z)}$ for $z \in Z$. Now define $g \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Ord})$ by $g(s) = \cup\{f_z(s) : z \in Z\}$; clearly g exists and $g \leq \bar{\alpha}$. But for each $s \in Y$, the set $\{f_z(s) : z \in Z\}$ is a subset of α_s of cardinality $< \mathrm{hrtg}(Z)$ hence $<$ $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha_s)$ hence $g(s) < \alpha_s$. Together $g \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ is a $<_D$-upper bound of $\cup\{\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\}$, contradiction to the choice of $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$.
2) Otherwise let $\theta < \mathrm{hrtg}(Z), \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ be increasing with limit $\mathrm{rk}_D(\bar{\alpha})$ and again let g be a function from Z onto θ. As AC_Z holds, we can find $\langle f_z : z \in Z \rangle$ such that for every $z \in Z$ we have $\mathrm{rk}_D(f_z) \geq \alpha_{h(z)}$ and $f_z <_D \bar{\alpha}$ and without loss of generality$f_z \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$. Let $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ be $f(t) = \sup\{f_{h(z)}(t) : z \in Z\}$ so $\mathrm{rk}_D(f) \geq \sup\{\alpha_z : z \in Z\} = \mathrm{rk}_D(\bar{\alpha}) > \mathrm{rk}_D(f)$, contradiction. $\square_{1.1}$

Theorem 1.2. *The Canonical Filter Theorem Assume* $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$.

Assume $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_t : t \in Y \rangle \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *and* $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ *and* $\partial \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ *hence is a regular cardinal. Then there is* $D = D^{\bar{\alpha}}_\partial$, *an* $\aleph_1$-*complete filter on* Y *such that* $\partial = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}/D)$ *and* $D \subseteq D'$ *for any other such* $D' \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(D)$.

Remark 1.3. 1) By [Sh:938, 5.9] there are some such ∂ if DC holds.
2) We work more to use just $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ and not more.
3) If $\kappa > \aleph_0$ we can replace "$\aleph_1$-complete" by "κ-complete".
4) If we waive "∂ regular" so just ∂, an ordinal, is a pseudo true cofinality of $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ for $D, \in \mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(Y)$, exemplified by $\bar{\mathscr{F}}^D, \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$ the proof gives some $\partial', \mathrm{cf}(\gamma') = f(\gamma)$ and $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ witnessing $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_*})$ has pseudo true cofinality where $D_* = \cap\{D : D \in \mathbb{D}\}$.

Proof. Note that by 1.1

$$\boxplus_1 \ \oplus \quad \partial \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)).$$

Let

$\boxplus_2$ (a) $\mathbb{D} = \{D : D$ is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y such that $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}/D)$ has pseudo true cofinality $\partial\}$,

(b) $D_* = \cap\{D : D \in \mathbb{D}\}$.

Now obviously

$\boxplus_3$ (a) $\mathbb{D}$ is non-empty
(b) D_* is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y.

For $A \subseteq Y$ let $\mathbb{D}_A = \{D \in \mathbb{D} : A \notin D\}$ and let $\mathscr{P}_* = \{A \subseteq Y : \mathbb{D}_A \neq \emptyset\}$, equivalently $\mathscr{P}_* = \{A \subseteq Y : A \neq \emptyset \bmod D\}$. As $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ holds we can find $\langle D_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle$ such that $D_A \in \mathbb{D}_A$ for $A \in \mathscr{P}_*$. Let $\mathbb{D}_* = \{D_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$, clearly

$\boxplus_4$ (a) $D_* = \cap\{D : D \in \mathbb{D}_*\}$
(b) $\mathbb{D}_* \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ is non-empty.

As $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}_*}$ holds clearly

$(*)_1$ we can choose $\langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}^A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle$ such that $\bar{\mathscr{F}}^A$ exemplifies $D_A \in \mathbb{D}$ as in [Sh:938, 5.17,(1),(2)], so in particular is $\aleph_0$-continuous and without loss of generality $\mathscr{F}^A_\alpha \neq \emptyset, \mathscr{F}^A_\alpha \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ for every $\alpha < \partial$.

For each $\beta < \partial$ let

$(*)_2$ $\mathbf{F}^1_\beta = \{\bar{f} = \langle f_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle : \bar{f}$ satisfies $A \in \mathscr{P}_* \Rightarrow f_A \in \mathscr{F}^A_\beta\}$
$(*)_3$ for $\bar{f} \in \mathbf{F}^1_\beta$ let $\sup\{f_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$ be the function $f \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ defined by $f(y) = \sup\{f_A(y) : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$
$(*)_4$ $\mathscr{F}^1_\beta = \{\sup\{f_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\} : \bar{f} = \langle f_A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle$ belongs to $\mathbf{F}^1_\beta\}$.

Now

$(*)_5$ (a) $\langle \mathscr{F}^1_\beta : \beta < \partial\rangle$ is well defined, i.e. exist
(b) $\mathscr{F}^1_\beta \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$.

[Why? Clause (a) holds by the definitions, clause (b) holds as $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$.]

$(*)_6$ $\mathscr{F}^1_\beta \neq \emptyset$ for $\beta < \partial$.

[Why? As for $\beta < \lambda$, the sequence $\langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}^A_\beta : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle$ is well defined (as $\langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}^A : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\rangle$ is) and $A \in \mathscr{P}_* \Rightarrow \mathscr{F}^A_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, so we can use $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ to deduce $\mathscr{F}^1_\beta \neq \emptyset$.]

Define

$(*)_7$ (a) for $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ and $A \in \mathscr{P}_*$ let
$\beta_A(f) = \min\{\beta < \lambda : f < g \bmod D_A$ for every $g \in \mathscr{F}^A_\beta\}$
(b) for $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ let $\beta(f) = \sup\{\beta_A(f) : A \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$.

Now

$(*)_8$ for $A \in \mathscr{P}_*$ and $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$, the ordinal $\beta_A(f) < \partial$ is well defined.

[Why? As $\langle \mathscr{F}^A_\gamma : \gamma < \partial\rangle$ is cofinal in $(\Pi, \bar{\alpha}, <_{D_A})$.]

$(*)_9$ (a) for $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ the ordinal $\beta(f)$ is well defined and $< \partial$
(b) if $f \leq g$ are from $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$ then $\beta(f) \leq \beta(g)$.

[Why? For clause (a), first, $\beta(f)$ is well defined and $\le \partial$ by $(*)_8$ and the definition of $\beta(f)$ in $(*)_7(b)$. Second, recalling that ∂ is regular $\ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}_*)$ clearly $\beta(f) < \partial$. Clause (b) is obvious.]

Now

$(*)_{10}$ (a) if $A \in \mathscr{P}_*, \gamma < \partial$ and $f \in \mathscr{F}^A_\gamma$ then $\beta_A(f) > \gamma$
(b) if $\gamma < \partial$ and $f \in \mathscr{F}^1_\gamma$ then $\beta_A(f) > \gamma$.

[Why? Clause (a) holds because $\beta < \gamma \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}^A_\gamma \Rightarrow g < f \bmod D_A$ and $\beta = \gamma \Rightarrow f \in \mathscr{F}^A_\gamma \wedge f \nleq f \bmod D_A$. Clause (b) holds because for some $\langle f_B : B \in \mathscr{P}_* \rangle \in \Pi\{F^B_\gamma : B \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$ we have $f = \sup\{f_B : B \in \mathscr{P}_*\}$ hence $B \in \mathscr{P}_* \Rightarrow f_B \le f$ hence in particular $f_A \le f$, recalling $\beta(f_A) > \gamma$ by clause (a) it follows that $\beta(f) > \gamma$.]

$(*)_{11}$ (a) for $\xi < \partial$ let $\gamma_\xi = \min\{\beta(f) : f \in \mathscr{F}^1_\xi\}$
(b) for $\xi < \partial$ let $\mathscr{F}^2_\xi = \{f \in \mathscr{F}^1_\xi : \beta(f) = \gamma_\xi\}$

$(*)_{12}$ (a) $\langle (\gamma_\xi, \mathscr{F}^2_\xi) : \xi < \partial \rangle$ is well defined, i.e. exists
(b) if $\xi < \partial$ then $\xi < \gamma_\xi < \partial$.

[Why? γ_ξ is the minimum of a set of ordinals which is non-empty by $(*)_6$ and $\subseteq \partial$, by $(*)_8$, and all members are $> \gamma$ by $(*)_{10}(a)$.]

$(*)_{13}$ for $\xi < \partial$ we have $\mathscr{F}^2_\xi \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ and $\mathscr{F}^2_\xi \neq \emptyset$.

[Why? By $(*)_{11}$ as $\mathscr{F}^1_\xi \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathscr{F}^1_\xi \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$.]

$(*)_{14}$ we try to define $\beta_\varepsilon < \partial$ by induction on the ordinal $\varepsilon < \partial$
$\underline{\varepsilon = 0}$: $\beta_\varepsilon = 0$
$\underline{\varepsilon \text{ limit}}$: $\beta_\varepsilon = \cup\{\beta_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$
$\underline{\varepsilon = \zeta + 1}$: $\beta_\varepsilon = \gamma_{\beta_\zeta}$

$(*)_{15}$ (a) if $\varepsilon < \partial$ then $\beta_\varepsilon < \partial$ is well defined $\ge \varepsilon$
(b) if $\zeta < \varepsilon$ is well defined then $\beta_\zeta < \beta_\varepsilon$.

[Why? Clause (a) holds as ∂ is a regular cardinal so the case ε limit is O.K., the $\varepsilon = \zeta + 1$ holds by $(*)_{12}$. As for clause (b) recall $\beta_A(f) > \xi$ for $f \in \mathscr{F}^1_\xi$ by $(*)_{10}(b)$.]

$(*)_{16}$ if $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$, then for some $g \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}^2_{\beta_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \partial\}$ we have $f < g \bmod D$.

[Why? Recall that $\beta_A(f)$ for $A \in \mathscr{P}_*$ and $\beta(f)$ are well defined ordinals $< \partial$ and let $\zeta < \partial$ be such that $\beta(f) < \beta_\zeta$, exists as $\beta_\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon$. As $\bar{\mathscr{F}}^A$ is $<_{D_A}$-increasing for $A \in \mathscr{P}_*$ clearly $A \in \mathscr{P}_* \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}^A_{\beta_\zeta} \Rightarrow f < g \bmod D_A$. So by the definition of $\mathscr{F}^1_{\beta_\zeta}$ we have $A \in \mathscr{P}_* \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}^1_{\beta_\zeta} \Rightarrow f < g \bmod D_A$ hence $g \in \mathscr{F}^1_{\beta_\zeta} \Rightarrow f < g \bmod D_*$. As $\mathscr{F}^2_{\beta_\zeta} \subseteq \mathscr{F}^1_{\beta_\zeta}$ we are done.]

$(*)_{17}$ if $\zeta < \xi < \partial$ and $f \in \mathscr{F}^2_\zeta$ and $g \in \mathscr{F}_\xi$ then $f < g \bmod D_*$.

[Why? As in the proof of $(*)_{16}$ but now $\beta(f) = \gamma_\zeta$.]

Together by $(*)_{13} + (*)_{16} + (*)_{17}$ the sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}^2_{\beta_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ is as required. $\square_{1.2}$

A central definition here is

Definition 1.4. 1) For $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ let $J^{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha] = \{X \subseteq Y\colon \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha \restriction X) \subseteq \lambda\}$. So for $X \subseteq Y, X \notin J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha]$ iff there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $X \neq \emptyset \mod D$ and $\text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$ is well defined $\geq \lambda$ iff there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $\text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$ is well defined $\geq \lambda$ and $X \in D$.
2) $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\leq\lambda}$ is $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda^+}$ and we can use a set $\mathfrak{a}$ of ordinals instead of $\bar\alpha$.

Claim 1.5. *The Generator Existence Claim*
Let $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y(\text{Ord}\backslash\{0\})$.
1) $J^{<\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}(\bar\alpha)$ *is an* $\aleph_1$*-complete ideal on* Y *for any cardinal* λ *except that it may be* $\mathscr{P}(Y)$.
2) [$\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$*] Assume* $t \in Y \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$. *If* $\lambda \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$ *then* *for some* $X \subseteq Y$ *we have*

- (A) $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda^+}[\bar\alpha] = J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha] + X$
- (B) $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_{J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{=\lambda}[\bar\alpha]})$ *where* $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{=\lambda}[\bar\alpha] := J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha] + (Y\backslash X)$
- (C) $\lambda \notin \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha \restriction (Y\backslash X))$.

Remark 1.6. Recall that if $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ then without loss of generality $\text{AC}_{\aleph_0}$ holds. Why? Otherwise by $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ we have Y is well ordered and AC_Y hence $|Y| = n$ for some $n < \omega$ and in this case our claims are obvious, e.g. 1.5(2), 1.7.

Proof. 1) If not then we can find a sequence $\langle A_n : n < \omega\rangle$ of members of $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha]$ such that their union $A := \cup\{A_n : n < \omega\}$ does not belong to it. As $A \notin J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha]$, by the definition there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $A \neq \emptyset \mod D$ and $\text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$ is well defined, so let it be $\mu = \text{cf}(\mu) \geq \lambda$ and let $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ exemplify it.

As D is $\aleph_1$-complete and $A = \cup\{A_n : n < \omega\} \neq \emptyset \mod D$ necessarily for some $n, A_n \neq \emptyset \mod D$ but then D witness $A_n \notin J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha]$, contradiction.
2) Recall λ is a regular cardinal by [Sh:938, 5.8(0)] and $\lambda \geq \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ by 1.1.

Let $D = D^{\bar\alpha}_\lambda$ be as in [Sh:938, 5.19] when DC holds, and as in 1.2 in general, i.e. $\Pi\bar\alpha/D$ has pseudo true cofinality λ and D contains any other such $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y. Now if $X \in D^+$ then $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha \restriction X, <_{(D+X)\cap\mathscr{P}(X)})$ hence $X \notin J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha]$, so

- $(*)_1$ $X \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar\alpha] \Rightarrow X = \emptyset \mod D$.

A major point is

- $(*)_2$ some $X \in D$ belongs to $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda^+}[\bar\alpha]$.

Why $(*)_2$? The proof will take awhile; assume that not, we have $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ hence AC_D, so we can find $\langle(\bar{\mathscr{F}}^X, D_X, \lambda_X) : X \in D\rangle$ such that:

- (a) λ_X is a regular cardinal $\geq \lambda^+$, i.e. $> \lambda$
- (b) D_X is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y such that $X \in D_X$ and $\lambda_X = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_{D_X})$
- (c) $\bar{\mathscr{F}}^X = \langle \mathscr{F}^X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_X\rangle$ exemplifies that $\lambda_X = \text{ps-tcf }(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_{D_X})$
- (d) moreover $\bar{\mathscr{F}}^X$ is as in [Sh:938, 5.17(2)].

Let

(e) $D^*_1 = \{A \subseteq Y\colon$ for some $X_1 \in D$ we have $X \in D \wedge X \subseteq X_1 \Rightarrow A \in D_X\}$.

Clearly

(f) D^*_1 is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y extending D.

[Why? First, clearly $D^*_1 \subseteq \mathscr{P}(Y)$ and $\emptyset \notin D^*_1$ as $X \in D \Rightarrow \emptyset \notin D_X$. Second, if $A \in D$ then $X \in D \wedge X \subseteq A \Rightarrow A \in D_X$ by clause (b) hence choosing $X_1 = A$ the demand for "$A \in D^*_1$" holds so indeed $D \subseteq D^*_1$. Third, assume $\bar{A} = \langle A_n : n < \omega\rangle$ and "$A_n \in D^*_1$" for $n < \omega$, then for each A_n there is a witness $X_n \in D$, so by $\mathrm{AC}_{\aleph_0}$, recalling 1.6, there is an ω-sequence $\langle X_n : n < \omega\rangle$ with X_n witnessing $A_n \in D^*_1$. Then $X = \cap\{X_n : n < \omega\}$ belongs to D and witness that $A := \cap\{A_n : n < \omega\} \in D^*_1$ because D is $\aleph_1$-complete. Fourth, if $A \subseteq B \subseteq Y$ and $A \in D^*_1$, then some X_1 witness $A \in D^*_1$, i.e. $X \in D \wedge X \subseteq X_1 \Rightarrow A \in D_X$; but then X_1 witness also $B \in D^*_1$.]

(g) assume $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ is $<_D$-increasing in $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$, i.e. $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ and $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \wedge f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_1} \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_1} \Rightarrow f_1 <_D f_2$ and $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ for every or at least unboundedly many $\alpha < \lambda$ then $\bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\lambda} \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ has a common $<_{D^*_1}$-upper bound.

[Why? For each $X \in D$ recall $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_X})$ has true cofinality λ_X which is regular $> \lambda$ hence by [Sh:938, 5.7(1A)] is pseudo λ^+-directed hence there is a common $<_{D_X}$-upper bounded h_X of $\cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$. As we have $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ we can find a sequence $\langle h_X : X \in D\rangle$ with each h_X as above. Define $h \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ by $h(t) = \sup\{h_X(t) : X \in D\}$, it belongs to $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$ as we are assuming $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$. So $h \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ is a $<_{D_X}$-upper bound of $\cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ for every $X \in D$, hence by the choice of D^*_1 it is a $<_{D^*_1}$-upper bound of $\cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$.]

But by the choice of D in the beginning of the proof we have $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ so there is a sequence $\langle \hat{\mathscr{F}}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ witnessing it. By clauses (f) + (g) we have $D \subseteq D^*_1$ so clearly $\langle \hat{\mathscr{F}}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ is $<_{D^*_1}$-increasing hence we can apply clause (g) to the sequence $\langle \hat{\mathscr{F}}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ and got a $<_{D^*_1}$-upper bound $f \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$, contradiction to the choice of $\langle \hat{\mathscr{F}}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ because $D \subseteq D^*_1$. So $(*)_2$ really holds.

Choose X as in $(*)_2$, now

$(*)_3$ $D = \mathrm{dual}(J^{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}] + (Y \backslash X))$.

[Why? The inclusion $\supseteq$ holds by $(*)_1$ and $(*)_2$, i.e. the choice of X as a member of D. Now for every $Z \subseteq X$ which does not belong to $J^{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]$, by the definition of $J^{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]$ there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D_Z on Y to which Z belongs such that $\theta := \text{ps-cf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ is well defined and $\geq \lambda$. But $\theta \geq \lambda^+$ is impossible as we know that $Z \subseteq X \in J^{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}_{<\lambda^+}[\bar{\alpha}]$, so necessarily $\theta = \lambda$, hence by the choice of D by using 1.2 we have $D \subseteq D_Z$, hence $Z \neq \emptyset \mod D$. Together we are done.]

$(*)_4$ $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{J^{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}_{=\lambda}})$, see clause (B) of the conclusion of 1.5(2).

[Why? By $(*)_3$, the choice of $J^{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}_{=\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]$ and as $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$.]

$(*)_5$ $\lambda \notin \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha} \restriction (Y \backslash X))$.

[Why? Otherwise there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D' on Y such that $Y \backslash X \in D$ and $\lambda =$ ps-tcf$(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D'})$. But this contradicts the choice of D by using 1.2.]

So X is as required in the desired conclusion of 1.5(2): clause (B) by $(*)_4$, clause (C) by $(*)_5$ and clause (A) follows. Note that the notation $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{=\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]$ is justified, as if X' satisfies the requirements on X then $X' = X \bmod J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]$. $\square_{1.5}$

Conclusion 1.7. $[\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}]$ Assume $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and each α_t a limit ordinal of cofinality $\geq \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ and $\text{ps} - \text{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ is not empty.
1) If $t \in Y \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \text{hrtg}(\text{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(Y))$ then there is a function h such that:

$\bullet_1$ the domain of h is $\mathscr{P}(Y)$

$\bullet_2$ the range of h is ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}) \cup \{\mu : \mu = \sup(\mu \cap$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}))$ and μ has cofinality $\aleph_0$ or just for some $A \in \mathscr{P}(Y) \backslash J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\mu}[\bar{\alpha}]$ there is no $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $A \in D$ and $(\forall B \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\mu}[\bar{\alpha}])(Y \backslash B \in D$ and $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ has pseudo true cofinality$\}$, but see $\bullet_5$

$\bullet_3$ $A \subseteq B \subseteq Y \Rightarrow h(A) \leq h(B)$

$\bullet_4$ $h(A) = \min\{\lambda : A \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\leq\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]\}$

$\bullet_5$ if $h(A) = \lambda$, $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$ then $\lambda \in$ ps-tcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$, i.e. for some $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y we have $A \in D$ and ps-tcf$(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D) = \lambda$

$\bullet_6$ the set ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ has cardinality $< \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$

$\bullet_7$ if $h(A) = \lambda$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \aleph_0$ then we can find a sequence $\langle A_n : n < \omega\rangle$ such that $A = \cup\{A_n : n < \omega\}$ and $h(A_n) < \lambda$ for $n < \omega$

$\bullet_8$ $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}] = \{A \subseteq Y : h(A) < \lambda\}$ when $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$

$\bullet_9$ if cf(otp(ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}))) > \aleph_0$ then ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ has a last member.

2) Without the extra assumption of part (1), still there is h such that

$\bullet_1$ h is a function with domain $\mathscr{P}(Y)$

$\bullet_2$ the range of h is ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}) \cup \{\mu : \mu = \sup(\mu \cap$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}))$ and $\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ or just $\text{cf}(\mu) <$ hrtg(ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ and $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\mu}[\bar{\alpha}] \neq \cup\{J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\chi}[\bar{\alpha}] : \chi < \mu\}\}$

$\bullet_3$ $A \subseteq B \subseteq Y \Rightarrow h(A) \leq h(B)$

$\bullet_4$ $h(A) = \min\{\lambda : A \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\leq\lambda}[\bar{\alpha}]\}$

$\bullet_5$ if $h(A)$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda) \geq$ hrtg(ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}[\bar{\alpha}]$) then $\lambda \in$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$, i.e. there is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y such that $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ has true cofinality λ

$\bullet_6$ as above

$\bullet_7$ as above.

3) In part (1), if also AC_α holds for $\alpha < \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ then we can find a sequence $\langle X_\lambda : \lambda \in$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})\rangle$ of subsets of Y such that for every cardinality $\mu, J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\mu}[\bar{\alpha}]$ is the $\aleph_1$-complete ideal on Y generated by $\{X_\lambda : \lambda < \mu$ and $\lambda \in$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})\}$.

Proof. 1) Let $\Theta = \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$. We define function h from $\mathscr{P}(Y)$ into Θ^+ which is defined as the closure of $\Theta \cup \{0\}$, i.e. $\Theta \cup \{\mu : \mu = \sup(\mu \cap \Theta)\}$, by $h(X) = \text{Min}\{\lambda \in \Theta^+ : X \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\le\lambda}[\bar\alpha]\}$. It is well defined as $\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$ is a set (see [Sh:938, 5.8(2)]), non-empty by an assumption and $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\le\lambda}[\bar\alpha] = \mathscr{P}(Y)$ when $\lambda \ge \sup(\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha))$. This function, its range is included in Θ^+, but $\text{otp}(\Theta^+) \le \text{otp}(\Theta) + 1$; also clearly $\bullet_1$ of the conclusion holds. Also if $\lambda \in \Theta$ and X is as in 1.5(2) then $h(X) = \lambda$; so h is a function from $\mathscr{P}(Y)$ into Θ^+ and its range include Θ hence $|\Theta| < \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ so $\bullet_6$ holds. Now first by 1.1 we have $\theta \in \Theta\backslash\{0\} \Rightarrow \theta \ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$, hence $\theta \in \Theta\backslash\{0\} \Rightarrow \theta > \sup(\Theta \cap \theta)$ so the range of h is as required in $\bullet_2$.

Second, if $\lambda \in \Theta^+$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \aleph_0$ then clearly $\lambda \in \Theta^+\backslash\Theta$ and we can find an increasing sequence $\langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle$ of members of $\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}(\bar\alpha)$ with limit λ. For each n there is $X_n \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\le\lambda_n}[\bar\alpha]\backslash J^{\aleph_1\text{-comp}}_{<\lambda_n}[\bar\alpha]$ by 1.5(2), but $\text{AC}_{\aleph_0}$ holds, see 1.6 hence such a sequence $\langle X_n : n < \omega\rangle$ exists. Easily $A := \cup\{X_n : n < \omega\} \in \mathscr{P}(Y)$ satisfies $h(A) = \lambda$ hence $\lambda \in \text{Rang}(h)$. Third, if $\lambda = \sup(\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha))$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$, then $\bigcup\limits_{\mu<\lambda} J_{<\mu}[\bar\alpha] \ne \mathscr{P}(Y)$ while $J_{<\lambda^+}(\bar\alpha) = \mathscr{P}(Y)$ so $h(Y) = \lambda$.

Fourth, assume $\lambda = h(A), \lambda \notin \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$, we can find $\langle \lambda_i : i < \text{cf}(\lambda)\rangle$, an increasing sequence with limit λ, but by the definition of h necessarily $\lambda \cap \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$ is an unbounded subset of λ so without loss of generality all are members of $\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\Pi\bar\alpha)$. Now $\langle J_i := J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda_i}[\bar\alpha] : i < \text{cf}(\lambda)\rangle$ is a $\subseteq$-increasing sequence of $\aleph_1$-complete ideals on Y, no choice is needed, and by our present assumption $\aleph_0 < \text{cf}(\lambda)$ hence the union $J = \cup\{J_i : i < \text{cf}(\lambda)\}$ is an $\aleph_1$-complete ideal on Y and obviously $A \notin J$. So also $D_1 = \text{dual}(J) + A$ is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter hence by [Sh:938, 5.9] for some $\aleph_1$-complete ideal D_2 extending D_1 we have $\mu = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\alpha, <_{D_2})$ is well defined, so by 1.5(2) we have some $D_2 \cap J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{\le\mu}[\bar\alpha] \ne \emptyset$ but $\emptyset = D_2 \cap J_i = D_2 \cap J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda_1}[\bar\alpha]$ hence $\mu \ge \lambda_i$. Hence $\mu \ge \lambda_i$ for every $i < \text{cf}(\lambda)$ but λ is singular so $\mu > \lambda$ and $\mu \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)$. Hence $\chi := \min(\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)\backslash\lambda)$ is well defined and $J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\chi}[\bar\alpha] = J$. But as $h(A) < \chi$ we get that $A \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\chi}[\bar\alpha]$, contradiction.

So we have proved $\bullet_5$, the fifth clause of the conclusion and so $\text{Rang}(h) \subseteq \text{ps} - \text{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha) \cup \{\mu : \text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0 \text{ and } \mu = \sup(\mu \cap \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\bar\alpha)\}$. The other clauses follow from the properties of h.

2),3) Similar proof. $\square_{1.7}$

Definition 1.8. Assume $\text{cf}(\mu) < \text{hrtg}(Y)$ and μ is singular of uncountable cofinality limit of regulars. We let

(a) $\text{pp}^*_Y(\mu) = \sup\{\lambda :$ for some $\bar\alpha, D$ we have
  - (a) $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$,
  - (b) D is an $\aleph_1 -$ complete filter on Y
  - (c) $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_t : t \in Y\rangle$, each α_t regular
  - (d) $\mu = \lim_D \bar\alpha\}$

(b) $\text{pp}^+_Y(\mu) = \sup\{\lambda^+ : \lambda$ as above$\}$.

(c) similarly $\text{pp}^*_{\kappa-\text{comp},Y}(\mu), \text{pp}^+_{\kappa-\text{comp},Y}(\mu)$ restricting ourselves to κ-complete filters D; similarly for other properties

(d) we can replace Y by an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on Y, this means we fix D but not $\bar\alpha$ above.

Remark 1.9. 1) of course, if we consider sets Y such that AC_Y may fail, it is natural to omit the regularity demands, so $\bar{\alpha}$ is just a sequence of ordinals.
2) We may use $\bar{\alpha}$ a sequence of cardinals, not necessarily regular; see §3.

Conclusion 1.10. $[\mathrm{DC} + \mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}]$ Assume $\theta = \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) < \mu, \mu$ is as in Definition 1.8, $\mu_0 < \mu$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu_0^+) \wedge \mathrm{ps}-\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathrm{ps}-\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}) \subseteq \mu$. If $\sigma = |\mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu \backslash \mu_0| < \mu$ and $\kappa = |\mathrm{Reg} \cap \mathrm{pp}_Y^+(\mu) \backslash \mu_0|$ then $\kappa < \mathrm{hrtg}(\theta \times {}^Y\sigma)$.

Remark 1.11. In the ZFC parallel the assumption on $\mu_0 < \mu$ is not necessary.

Proof. Obvious by Definition [Sh:938, 5.6] noting Conclusion 1.7 above and 1.12 below. That is, letting $\Lambda = \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu \backslash \mu_0$, for every $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\Lambda$ by 1.8 the set ps-$\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ is a subset of $\Xi := \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mathrm{pp}_Y^+(\mu) \backslash \mu_0$, and by claim 1.7 it is a set of cardinality $< \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$. By Claim 1.12 below we have $\Xi = \cup\{\mathrm{ps}-\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}) : \bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\Lambda\}$. So there is a function h with domain $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \times {}^Y\sigma$ such that $\varepsilon < \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \wedge \bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\sigma \Rightarrow (h(\varepsilon, \bar{\alpha})$ is the ε-th member of ps-$\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$ if there is one, $\min(\Lambda)$ otherwise). So h is a function from $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \times {}^Y\sigma$ onto the set Ξ of cardinality κ, so we are done. $\square_{1.10}$

Claim 1.12. *The No Hole Claim[DC]*
1) If $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *and* $\lambda_2 \in \mathrm{ps}\text{-}\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha})$, *for transparency* $t \in Y \Rightarrow \alpha_t > 0$ *and* $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \leq \lambda_1 = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda_1) < \lambda_2$, *then for some* $\bar{\alpha}' \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ *we have* $\lambda_1 = \mathrm{ps}\text{-}\mathrm{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar{\alpha}')$.
2) In part (1), if in addition AC_Y *then* without loss of generality $\bar{\alpha}' \in {}^Y\mathrm{Reg}$.
3) If in addition $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)} + \mathrm{AC}_{<\kappa}$ *then even witnessed by the same filter (on* Y*).*

Proof. 1) Let D be an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y such that $\lambda_2 = \mathrm{ps}\text{-}\mathrm{tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$, let $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_2 \rangle$ exemplify this.

First assume $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(Y)) \leq \lambda_1$, clearly $f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha \Rightarrow \mathrm{rk}_D(f) \geq \alpha$ for every $\alpha < \lambda_2$, hence in particular for $\alpha = \lambda_1$ hence there is $f \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ such that $\mathrm{rk}_D(f) = \lambda_1$ and now use [Sh:938, 5.9] but there we change the filter D, (extend it). In general, i.e. without this extra assumption, use 1.13(1),(2) below.
2) Easy, too.
3) Similarly using 1.13(3) below. $\square_{1.12}$

Claim 1.13. *Assume* $D \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(Y), \kappa > \aleph_0, \mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *non-empty for* $\alpha < \delta$ *and* $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *is* $<_D$*-increasing,* δ *a limit ordinal.*

1) [DC] *There is* $f^* \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ *which satisfies* $f \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_1\} \Rightarrow f <_D f^*$ *but there is no such* $f^{**} \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ *satisfying* $f^{**} <_D f$.
2) [DC + $AC_{<\kappa}$*] For* f^* *as above, let* $D_1 = D_{f^*, \bar{\mathscr{F}}} := \{Y \backslash A : A = \emptyset \mod D$ *or* $A \in D^+$ *and there is* $f^{**} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *such that* $f^{**} <_{D+A} f^*$ *and* $f \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_1\} \Rightarrow f <_{D+A} f^{**}\}$. *Now* D_1 *is a* κ*-complete filter and* $\emptyset \notin D_1, D_1$ *extends* D *and if* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ *then* $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *witness that* f^* *is a* $<_{D_1}$*-exact upper bound of* $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ *hence* $(\prod\limits_{y \in Y} f^*(y), <_{D_1})$ *has pseudo-true-cofinality* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta)$.
3) [$\mathrm{DC} + \mathrm{AC}_{<\kappa} + \mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$*]*

If $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ *then there is* $f' \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *which is an* $<_D$*-exact upper bound of* $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$*, i.e.* $f <_D f' \Rightarrow (\exists \alpha < \delta)(\exists g \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha)[f < g \mod D]$ *and* $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha < \delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha \Rightarrow$ $f <_{D_1, f'}$.

Proof. 1) If not then by DC we can find $\bar{f} = \langle f_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $f_n \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$
- (b) $f_{n+1} < f_n \bmod D$
- (c) if $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and $n < \omega$ then $f < f_n \bmod D$.

So $A_n = \{t \in Y : f_{n+1}(t) < f_n(t)\} \in D$ hence $\cap\{A_n : n < \omega\} \in D$, contradiction.
2) First, clearly $D_1 \subseteq \mathscr{P}(Y)$ and by the assumption $\emptyset \notin D_1$. Second, if f^{**} witness $A \in D_1$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq Y$ then f^{**} witness $B \in D_1$.

Third, we prove D_1 is closed under intersection of $< \kappa$ members, so assume $\zeta < \kappa$ and $\bar{A} = \langle A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ is a sequence of members of D_1. Let $A := \cap\{A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}, B_\varepsilon = Y \backslash A_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon < \zeta$ and $B'_\varepsilon = B_\varepsilon \backslash \cup \{B_\xi : \xi < \varepsilon\}$ and $B = \cup\{B_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$. Clearly $B = Y \backslash A, A \subseteq Y$ and $\langle B'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint subsets of Y with union B. But AC_ζ holds hence we can find $\langle f^{**}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta \rangle$ such that f^{**}_ε witness $A_\varepsilon \in D_1$. Let $f^{**} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ be defined by $f^{**}(t) = f^{**}_\varepsilon(t)$ if $t \in B'_\varepsilon$ or $\varepsilon = 0 \wedge t \in Y \backslash B$; easily $B'_\varepsilon \in D^+ \wedge f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha \Rightarrow f < f^{**} \bmod (D + B'_\varepsilon)$ but $B = \cup\{B'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$ and D is κ-complete hence $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha \Rightarrow f < f^{**} \bmod (D + B)$. So as $A = Y \backslash B$ clearly f^{**} witness $A = \bigcap\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} A_\varepsilon \in D_1$ so D_1 is indeed κ-complete.

Lastly, assume $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ and we shall show that f^* is an exact upper bound of $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ modulo D_1. So assume $f^{**} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ and $f^{**} < f^* \bmod D_1$.

Let $\mathscr{A} = \{A \in D_1^+$: there is $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ such that $f^{**} \leq f \bmod (D + A)\}$, yes, not D_1!

Case 1: For every $B \in D_1^+$ there is $A \in \mathscr{A}, A \subseteq B$.

For every $A \in \mathscr{A}$ let $\alpha_A = \min\{\beta$: there is $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ such that $f^{**} \leq f \bmod (D + A)\}$.

So the sequence $\langle \alpha_A : A \in \mathscr{A} \rangle$ is well defined.

Let $\alpha(*) = \sup\{\alpha_A + 1 : A \in \mathscr{A}\}$, it is $< \delta$ as $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{A})$.

Now any $f \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha(*)}$ is as required because $\{t \in Y : f^{**}(t) \geq f(t)\}$ contains no $A \in \mathscr{A}$ hence is $= \emptyset \bmod D_1$ by the case assumption.

Case 2: $B \in D_1^+$ and there is no $A \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $A \subseteq B$.

So $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ implies $\{t \in B : f^{**}(t) \leq f(t)\} = \emptyset \bmod D_1$, i.e. $f < f^{**} \bmod (D_1 + B)$ so by the definition of D_1 we have $Y \backslash B \in D_1$, contradiction to the case assumption.
3) By [Sh:938, 5.12] without loss of generality $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ is $\aleph_0$-continuous. For every $A \in D^+$ the assumptions hold even if we replace D by $D + A$ and so there are D_1, f^* as in part (2), we are allowed to use part (2) as we have $\mathrm{AC}_{<\kappa}$. As we are assuming $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ there is a sequence $\langle (D_A, f_A) : A \in D^+ \rangle$ such that:

$(*)_1$ (a) D_A is a κ-complete filter extending $D + A$
(b) $f_A \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ is a $<_{D_A}$-exact upper bound of $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$.

Recall $|A| \leq_{\mathrm{qu}} |B|$ is defined as: A is empty or there is a function from B onto A. Of course, this implies $\mathrm{hrtg}(A) \leq \mathrm{hrtg}(B)$.

Let $\bar{\mathscr{U}} = \langle \mathscr{U}_t : t \in Y \rangle$ be defined by $\mathscr{U}_t = \{f_A(t) : A \in D^+\} \cup \{\sup\{f(t) : f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha\}\}$ hence $t \in Y \Rightarrow 0 < |\mathscr{U}_t| \le_{\rm qu} \mathscr{P}(Y)$ even uniformly (or recall that we have AC_Y) so there is a sequence $\langle h_t : t \in Y\rangle$ such that h_t is a function from $\mathscr{P}(Y)$ onto $\mathscr{U}_t$ hence $|\prod\limits_{t \in Y} \mathscr{U}_t| \le_{\rm qu} \mathscr{P}(Y) \times Y \le_{\rm qu} \mathscr{P}(Y \times Y)$ but $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ holds hence Y can be well ordered but without loss of generality Y is infinite hence $|Y \times Y| = Y$, so $|\prod\limits_{t \in Y} \mathscr{U}_t| \le_{\rm qu} |\mathscr{P}(Y)|$.

Let $\mathscr{G} = \{g : g \in \prod\limits_{t \in Y} \mathscr{U}_t$ and not for every $f \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ do we have $f < g \mod D\}$, so $|\mathscr{G}| \le |\prod\limits_{t\in Y} \mathscr{U}_t| \le_{\rm qu} |\mathscr{P}(Y \times Y)| = |\mathscr{P}(Y)|$ hence $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{G}) \le \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$.

Now for every $g \in \mathscr{G}$ the sequence $\langle \{\{t \in Y : g(t) \le f(t)\} : f \in \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} \mathscr{F}_\beta\} : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ is a $\subseteq$-increasing sequence of subsets of $\mathscr{P}(Y)$, but $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)) \le \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$ hence the sequence is eventually constant and let $\alpha(g) < \delta$ be minimal such that

$(*)_g$ $(\forall \beta)[\alpha(g) \le \beta < \delta \Rightarrow \{\{t \in Y : g(t) \le f(t)\} : f \in \bigcup\limits_{\gamma<\beta} \mathscr{F}_\gamma\} = \{\{t \in Y : g(t) \le f(t)\} : f \in \bigcup\limits_{\gamma<\alpha} \mathscr{F}_\gamma\}]$.

But recalling $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{G}) \le \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$, the ordinal $\alpha(*) := \sup\{\alpha(g) : g \in \mathscr{G}\}$ is $< \delta$. Now choose $f^* \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha(*)+1}$ and define $g^* \in \prod\limits_{t \in Y} \mathscr{U}_t$ by $g^*(t) = \min(\mathscr{U}_t \backslash f^*(t))$, well defined as $\sup\{f(t) : t \in \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \mathscr{F}_\alpha\} \in \mathscr{U}_t$. It is easy to check that g^* is as required. $\square_{1.13}$

Observation 1.14. Let D be a filter on Y.
If D is κ-complete for every κ then for every $f \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ and $A \in D^+$ there is $B \subseteq A$ from D^+ such that $f \restriction B$ is constant.

Proof. Straight. $\square_{1.14}$

§ 2. Composition and generating sequence of pseudo pcf

How much choice suffice to show $\lambda = \text{ptf}(\prod\limits_{(i,j)\in Y} \lambda_{i,j}/D)$ when λ_i is the pseudo true equality of $\prod\limits_{j\in Y_i} \lambda_{i,j}$ for $i \in Z$ where $Z = \{i : (i,j) \in Y\}$ and $Y_i = \{(i,j) : i \in Z, j \in Y_i\}$ and $\lambda =$ ps-tcf$(\prod\limits_{i\in Z} \lambda_i, <_E)$? This is 2.6, the parallel of [Sh:g, Ch.II,1.10,pg.12].

Claim 2.1. *If $\boxplus$ below holds then for some partition (Y_1, Y_2) of Y and club E of λ we have*

$\oplus$ (a) *if $Y_1 \in D^+$ and $f, g \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha \ge \min(E)\}$ then $f = g \bmod (D + Y_1)$*

(b) *if $Y_2 \in D^+$ then $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in E\rangle$ is $<_{D+Y_2}$-increasing*

where

$\boxplus$ (a) *λ is regular $\ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y)))$*

(b) *$\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq {}^Y\text{Ord}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ is non-empty*

(c) *if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \lambda$ and $f_\ell \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $f_1 \le f_2 \bmod D$.*

Proof. For $Z \in D^+$ let

$(*)_1$ (a) $S_Z = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \le \beta < \lambda$ and for some $f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and $g \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ we have $f < g \bmod (D + Z)\}$

(b) $S^+_Z = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha \le \beta < \lambda$ and for every $f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and $g \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ we have $f < g \bmod (D + Z)\}$.

Note

$(*)_2$ (a) if $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 \le \alpha_3 \le \alpha_4$ and $(\alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in S_Z$ then $(\alpha_1, \alpha_4) \in S_Z$

(b) similarly for S^+_Z

(c) if $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 \le \alpha_3 \le \alpha_4$ and $(\alpha_1 \ne \alpha_2) \wedge (\alpha_3 \ne \alpha_4)$ and $(\alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in S_Z$ then $(\alpha_1, \alpha_4) \in S^+_Z$

(d) $S_Z \subseteq S^+_Z$.

[Why? By the definitions.]

Let

$(*)_3$ $J := \{Z \subseteq Y : Z \in \text{dual}(D)$ or $Z \in D^+$ and $(\forall^\infty \alpha < \lambda)(\exists \beta)((\alpha, \beta) \in S^+_Z)$.

Next

$(*)_4$ (a) J is an $\aleph_1$-complete ideal on Y

(b) if D is κ-complete then J is κ-complete[1]

(c) $J = \{Z \subseteq Y : Z \in$ dual(D) or $Z \in D^+$ and $(\forall^\infty \alpha < \lambda)(\exists \beta)$ $((\alpha, \beta) \in S_Z)\}$.

[Why? For clauses (a),(b) check and for clause (c) recall $(*)_2(c)$.]

Let

---

[1] note that AC_κ holds in the non-trivial case as $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$ holds, see 1.14

$(*)_5$ (a) for $Z \in J^+$ let $\alpha(Z) = \min\{\alpha < \lambda$: for no $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda)$ do we have $(\alpha, \beta) \in S_Z\}$

(b) $\alpha(*) = \sup\{\alpha_Z : Z \in J^+\}$

$(*)_6$ (a) for $Z \in J^+$ we have $\alpha(Z) < \lambda$

(b) $\alpha(*) < \lambda$.

[Why? Clause (a) by the definition of the ideal J, and clause (b) as $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$.]

Let

$(*)_7$ (a) for $Z \in D^+$ let $f_Z : \lambda \to \lambda + 1$ be defined by $f_Z(\alpha) = \mathrm{Min}\{\beta : (\alpha, \beta) \in S^+_Z$ or $\beta = \lambda\}$

(b) $f_* : \lambda \to \lambda$ be defined by: $f_*(\alpha) = \sup\{f_Z(\alpha) : Z \in D^+ \cap J\}$

(c) $E = \{\delta : \delta$ a limit ordinal $< \lambda$ such that $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow f_*(\alpha) < \delta\} \backslash \alpha(*)$.

Hence

$(*)_8$ (a) if $Z \in D^+ \cap J$ then f_Z is indeed a function from λ to λ

(b) f_* is indeed a function from λ to λ

(c) E is a club of λ.

[Why? Clause (a) by the definition of J and clause (b) as $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ and clause (c) follows from (b).]

$(*)_9$ Let $\alpha_0 = \min(E), \alpha_1 = \min(E \backslash (\alpha_0 + 1))$ choose $f_0 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_0}, f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_1}$ and let $Y_1 = \{y \in Y : f_0(y) = f_1(y)\}$ and $Y_2 = Y \backslash Y_1$

$(*)_{10}$ (Y_1, Y_2, E) are as required.

[Why? Think.] $\square_{2.1}$

Claim 2.2. *[AC_Y]*

We have $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\bar{\alpha}_1, <_D)$ *__when__*

(a) $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *and* $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Y)$

(b) *E is the equivalence relation on Y such that* $sEt \Leftrightarrow \alpha_s = \alpha_t$

(c) $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$

(d) $Y_1 = Y/E$

(e) $D_1 = \{Z \subseteq Y/E : \cup\{X : X \in Z\} \in D\}$

(f) $\bar{\alpha}_1 = \langle \alpha_{1,y_1} : y_1 \in Y_1 \rangle$ *where* $y_1 = y/E \Rightarrow \alpha_{1,y_1} = \alpha_y$.

Remark 2.3. But see 2.4 which eliminates AC_Y.

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$. For $f \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ let $f^{[*]} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ be defined by $f^{[*]}(s) = \sup\{f(t) : t \in s/E\}$. Clearly $f^{[*]} \in \Pi\bar{\alpha}$ as $t \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_t) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Y)$ by clause (a) of the assumption. Let $\mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha = \{f^{[*]} : f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha\}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ so $\langle \mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exists and $\mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}$. Also $f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_1} \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_2} \wedge \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \lambda \Rightarrow f_1 \leq_D f_2 \Rightarrow f^{[*]}_1 \leq_D f^{[*]}_2$ hence $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \lambda \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}^{[*]}_1 \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}^{[*]}_2 \Rightarrow f_1 \leq_D f_2$.

Now apply 2.1, getting (Y'_1, Y'_2) as there, but by the choice of $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ necessarily $Y'_1 = \emptyset \mod D$. Hence for some club E of λ, $\langle \mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha : \alpha \in E \rangle$ is $<_D$-increasing cofinal in $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$.

Lastly, for $f \in \cup\{\mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha : \alpha \in E\}$ let $f^{[**]} \in {}^{(Y_1)}\mathrm{Ord}$ be defined by $f^{[**]}(t/E) = f(t)$, well defined as $f{\restriction}(t/E)$ is constant. Let $\mathscr{F}^{[**]}_\alpha := \{f^{[**]} : f \in \mathscr{F}^{[*]}_\alpha\}$ for $\alpha \in E$. Easily $\langle \mathscr{F}^{[**]}_\alpha : \alpha \in E\rangle$ witness the desired conclusions. $\square_{2.2}$

By the following claims we do not really lose by using $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{Reg}$ instead $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ as by **??**, without loss of generality $\alpha_t = d(\alpha_t)$ (when AC_Y) and by 2.4 (or **??** of AC_Y).

Claim 2.4. *Assume* $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$, $D \in \mathrm{Fil}(Y)$ *and* $\lambda = \text{ps-pcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$ *so* λ *is regular and* $y \in Y \Rightarrow \alpha_y < \lambda$.

If $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *witness* $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$ *and* $y \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_y) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Y)$ *and* $\lambda \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(Y)$ *then for some e:*

(a) $e \in \mathrm{eq}(Y) = \{e : e$ *an equivalence relation on* $Y\}$

(b) *the sequence* $\mathscr{F}_e = \langle \mathscr{F}_{e,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *witness* $\text{ps-tcf}(\langle \alpha_{y/e} : y \in Y/e\rangle, D/e\rangle$ *where*

(c) $\alpha_{y/e} = \alpha_y, D/e = \{A/e : A \in D\}$ *where* $A/e = \{y/e : y \in A\}$ *and* $\mathscr{F}_{e,\alpha} = \{f^{[*]} : f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha\}, f^{[*]} : Y/e \to \mathrm{Ord}$ *is defined by* $f^{[*]}(t/e) = \sup\{f(s) : s \in t/e\}$*; noting* $\mathrm{hrtg}(Y/e) \leq \mathrm{hrtg}(Y)$.

Proof. Let $e = \mathrm{eq}(\bar\alpha) = \{(y_1, y_2) : y_1 \in Y, y_2 \in Y \text{ and } \alpha_{y_1} = \alpha_{y_2}\}$. For each $f \in \Pi\bar\alpha$ let the function $f^{[*]} \in \Pi\bar\alpha$ be defined by $f^{[*]}(y) = \sup\{f(z) : z \in y/e\}$. Clearly $f^{[*]}$ is a function from $\prod\limits_{y \in Y}(\alpha_y + 1)$ and it belongs to $\Pi\bar\alpha$ as $y \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha_y) \geq \mathrm{hrtg}(y)$. Let $H : \lambda \to \lambda$ be: $H(\alpha) = \min\{\beta < \lambda : \beta > \alpha$ and there are $f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and $f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ such that $f_1^{[*]} < f_2 \bmod D\}$, well defined as $\mathscr{F}$ is cofinal in $(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$. We choose $\alpha_i < \lambda$ by induction on i by: $\alpha_i = \cup\{H(\alpha_j) + 1 : j < i\}$. So $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\langle \alpha_i : i < \lambda\rangle$ is increasing continuous. Let $\mathscr{F}'_i = \{f^{[*]} : f \in g_{\alpha_i}$ and there is $g \in \mathscr{F}_{H(\alpha_i)} = \mathscr{F}_{\alpha_{i+1}-1}$ such that $f < g \bmod D\}$.

So

$(*)_1$ $\mathscr{F}'_i \subseteq \Pi\{f \in \Pi\bar\alpha : \mathrm{eq}(f)$ refine $\mathrm{eq}(\bar\alpha)\}$.

[By its choice]

$(*)_2$ $\mathscr{F}'_i$ is non-empty.

[Why? By the choice of $H(\alpha_i)$.]

$(*)_3$ if $i(1) < i(2) < \lambda$ and $h_\ell \in \mathscr{F}'_{i_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $g_1 < g_2 \bmod D$.

[Why? Let $g_1 \in F_{H(\alpha_{i(1)})}$ be such that $h_1^{[*]} \leq g_1 \bmod D$, exists by the definition of $\mathscr{F}^1_{i(1)}$. But $H(\alpha_{i(1)}) < \alpha_{i(1)+1} \leq \alpha_{i(2)}$ hence $g_1 \leq h_2 \bmod D$ so together we are done.]

$(*)_4$ $\bigcup\limits_{i<\lambda} \mathscr{F}'_i$ is cofinal in $(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$.

[Easy, too.]

Lastly, let $\mathscr{F}^+_i = \{f/e : e \in \mathscr{F}'_i\}$ where $f/e \in {}^{Y/e}\mathrm{Ord}$, is defined by $(f/e)(y/e) = f(y)$, clearly well defined. $\square_{2.4}$

Claim 2.5. *Assume* AC_Y *and* $\bar\alpha_\ell = \langle \alpha^\ell_y : y \in Y\rangle \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ *for* $\ell = 1, 2$. *If* $y \in Y \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\alpha^1_y) = \mathrm{cf}(\alpha^2_y)$ *then* $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha_1, <_D)$ *iff* $\lambda = \mathrm{ps} - \mathrm{tcf}(\Pi\bar\alpha_2, <_D)$.

Proof. Straight. $\square$

Now we come to the heart of the matter

Theorem 2.6. *The Composition Theorem [Assume* AC_Z *and* $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$*]*
We have $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\prod\limits_{(i,j)\in Y} \lambda_{i,j}, <_D)$ *and* D *is a* κ*-complete filter on* Y *when:*

- (a) E *is a* κ*-complete filter on* Z
- (b) $\langle \lambda_i : i \in Z\rangle$ *is a sequence of regular cardinals*
- (c) $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\prod\limits_{i\in Z} \lambda_i, <_E)$
- (d) $\bar{Y} = \langle Y_i : i \in Z\rangle$
- (e) $\bar{D} = \langle D_i : i \in Z\rangle$
- (f) D_i *is a* κ*-complete filter on* Y_i
- (g) $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_{i,j} : i \in Z, j \in Y_i\rangle$ *is a sequence of regular cardinals (or just limit ordinals)*
- (h) $\lambda_i = \text{ps-tcf}(\prod\limits_{j\in Y_i} \lambda_{i,j}, <_{D_i})$
- (i) $Y = \{(i,j) : j \in Y_i$ *and* $i \in Z\}$
- (j) $D = \{A \subseteq Y$*: for some* $B \in E$ *we have* $i \in B \Rightarrow \{j : (i,j) \in A\} \in D_i\}$.

Proof.
$(*)_0$ D is a κ-complete filter on Y.

[Why? Straight (and do not need any choice).]
Let $\langle \mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda_i, i \in Z\rangle$ be such that

$(*)_1$ (a) $\bar{\mathscr{F}}_i = \langle \mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda_i\rangle$ witness $\lambda_i = \text{ps-tcf}(\prod\limits_{j\in y_i} \lambda_{i,j}, <_{D_i})$
(b) $\mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.

[Why? Exists by clause (h) of the assumption and AC_Z, for clause (b) recall [Sh:938, 5.6].]
By clause (c) of the assumption let $\bar{\mathscr{G}}$ be such that

$(*)_2$ (a) $\bar{\mathscr{G}} = \langle \mathscr{G}_\beta : \beta < \lambda\rangle$ witness $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\prod\limits_{i\in Z} \lambda_i, <_E)$
(b) $\mathscr{G}_\beta \neq \emptyset$ for $\beta < \lambda$.

Now for $\beta < \lambda$ let

$(*)_3$ $\mathscr{F}_\beta := \{f : f \in \prod\limits_{(i,j)\in Y} \lambda_{i,j}$ and for some $g \in \mathscr{G}_\beta$ and $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i \in Z\rangle \in \prod\limits_{i\in Z} \mathscr{F}_{i,g(i)}$ we have $(i,j) \in y \Rightarrow f((i,j)) = h_i(j)\}$

$(*)_4$ the sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\beta : \beta < \lambda\rangle$ is well defined (so exists)

$(*)_5$ if $\beta_1 < \beta_2, f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{\beta_1}$ and $f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_{\beta_2}$ then $f^*_1 <_D f^*_2$.

[Why? Let $g_\ell \in \mathscr{G}_{\beta_\ell}$ and $\bar{h}_\ell = \langle h^\ell_i : i \in Z\rangle \in \prod\limits_{i \in Z} \mathscr{F}_{i,g_\ell(i)}$, witness $f_\ell \in \mathscr{F}_{\beta_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1,2$. As $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ by $(*)_2$ we have $B := \{i \in Z : g_1(i) < g_2(i)\} \in E$. For each $i \in B$ we know that $g_1(i) < g_2(i) < \lambda_i$ and as $h^1_i \in \mathscr{F}_{i,g_i(i)}, h^2_i \in \mathscr{F}_{i,g_2(i)}$, recalling the choice of $\langle \mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda_i\rangle$, see $(*)_1$, we have $A_i \in D_i$ where for every $i \in Z$ we let $A_i := \{j \in Y_i : h^1_i(j) < h^2_i(j)\}$. As $\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2$ exists clearly $\langle A_i : i \in Z\rangle$ exist hence $A = \{(i,j) : i \in B \text{ and } j \in A_i\}$ is a well defined subset of Y and it belongs to D by the definition of D.

Lastly $(i,j) \in A \Rightarrow f_1((i,j)) < f_2((i,j))$ shown above; so by the definition of D we are done.]

$(*)_6$ for every $\beta < \lambda$ the set $\mathscr{F}_\beta$ is non-empty.

[Why? Recall $\mathscr{G}_\beta \neq \emptyset$ by $(*)_2$ and let $g \in \mathscr{G}_\beta$. As $\langle \mathscr{F}_{i,g(i)} : i \in Z\rangle$ is a sequence of non-empty sets, and we are assuming AC_Z there is a sequence $\langle h_i : i \in Z\rangle \in \prod\limits_{i \in Z} \mathscr{F}_{i,g(i)}$. Let f be the function with domain Y defined by $f((i,j)) = h_i(j)$; so $g, \bar{h}$ witness $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$, so $\mathscr{F}_\beta \neq \emptyset$ as required.]

$(*)_7$ if $f_* \in \prod\limits_{(i,j) \in Y} \lambda_{i,j}$ then for some $\beta < \lambda$ and $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ we have
$f_* < f \bmod D$.

[Why? We define $\bar{f} = \langle f^*_i : i \in Z\rangle$ as follows: f^*_i is the function with domain Y_i such that

$$j \in Y_i \Rightarrow f^*_i(j) = f((i,j)).$$

Clearly $\bar{f}$ is well defined and for each $i, f^*_i \in \prod_{j \in Y_i} \lambda_{i,j}$ hence by $(*)_1(a)$ for some $\alpha < \lambda_i$ and $h \in \mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha}$ we have $f^*_i < h \bmod D_i$ and let α_i be the first such α so $\langle \alpha_i : i \in Z\rangle$ exists.

By the choice of $\langle \mathscr{G}_\beta : \beta < \lambda\rangle$ there are $\beta < \lambda$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}_\beta$ such that $\langle \alpha_i : i \in Z\rangle < g \bmod E$ hence $A := \{i \in Z : \alpha_i < g(i)\}$ belongs to E. So $\langle \mathscr{F}_{i,g(i)} : i \in Z\rangle$ is a sequence of non-empty sets hence recalling AC_Z there is a sequence $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i \in Z\rangle \in \prod\limits_{i \in Z} \mathscr{F}_{i,g(i)}$. By the property of $\langle \mathscr{F}_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda_i\rangle$, we have $i \in A \Rightarrow f^*_i < h_i \bmod D_i$.

Lastly, let $f \in \prod\limits_{(i,j) \in Y} \lambda_{i,j}$ be defined by $f((i,j)) = h_i(j)$. Easily $g, \bar{h}$ witness that $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$, and by the definition of D, recalling $A \in E$ and the choice of $\bar{h}$ we have $f_* < f \bmod D$, so we are done.]

Together we are done proving the theorem. $\square_{2.6}$

Conclusion 2.7. The pcf closure conclusion Assume $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})}$. We have $\mathfrak{c} =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\mathfrak{c})$ when:

- (a) $\mathfrak{a}$ a set of regular cardinals
- (b) $\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})) < \min(\mathfrak{a})$
- (c) $\mathfrak{c} = \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Proof. Assume $\lambda \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\mathrm{comp}}(\mathfrak{c})$, hence there is E an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on $\mathfrak{c}$ such that $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak{c}, <_E)$. As we have $\mathrm{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})}$ by 1.2 (as the D there is unique) there is a sequence $\langle D_\theta : \theta \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle, D_\theta$ an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $\theta =$ ps-tcf$(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, <_{D_\theta})$, also by 1.7 there is a function h from $\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})$ onto $\mathfrak{c}$, let $E_1 = \{S \subseteq$

$\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a}) : \{\theta \in \mathfrak{c} : h^{-1}\{\theta\} \subseteq S\} \in E\}$. Similarly to 2.2 with $\mathscr{P}(Y)$ here standing for Y there, we have $\lambda =$ ps-tcf $(\Pi\{h(A) : A \in \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})\}, <_{E_1})$ and E_1 is an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on $\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Now we apply Theorem 2.6 with $E_1, \langle D_{h(\mathfrak{b})} : \mathfrak{b} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle, \lambda, \langle h(\mathfrak{b}) : \mathfrak{b} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle, \langle \theta : \theta \in \mathfrak{a}\rangle$ here standing for $E, \langle D_i : i \in Z\rangle, \lambda, \langle \lambda_i : i \in Z\rangle, \langle \lambda_{i,j} : j \in Y_i\rangle$ for every $j \in Z$ (constant here). We get a filter D_1 on $Y = \{(\mathfrak{b}, \theta) : \mathfrak{b} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a}), \theta \in \mathfrak{a}\rangle$ such that $\lambda = \text{ps} - \text{tcf}(\Pi\{\theta : (b,\theta) \in Y\}, <_{D_1})$.

Now $|Y| = |\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})|$ as $\aleph_0 \leq |\mathfrak{a}|$ or $\mathfrak{a}$ finite and all is trivial so applying 2.2 again we get an $\aleph_1$-complete filter D on $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $\lambda =$ ps-tcf$(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, <_D)$, so we are done. $\square_{2.7}$

Theorem 2.8. *Assume* $\text{AC}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ *and* $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})}$. *Then* $\mathfrak{c} =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{c})$ *has a closed generating sequence for* $\aleph_1$*-complete filters (see below) when:*

(*a*) $\mathfrak{a}$ *is a set of regular cardinals*

(*b*) $\text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})) < \min(\mathfrak{a})$

(*c*) $\mathfrak{c} =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Definition 2.9. For a set $\mathfrak{a}$ of regular cardinals.
1) We say $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} = \langle \mathfrak{b}_\lambda : \lambda \in$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle$ is a generating sequence for $\mathfrak{a}$ when:

(α) $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{c} \subseteq$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})$

(β) $J_{<\lambda}[\mathfrak{a}]$ is the $\aleph_1$-complete ideal in $\mathfrak{a}$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{b}_\theta : \theta \in \text{pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $\theta < \lambda\}$.

2) We say $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ is a witness for $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} = \langle \mathfrak{b}_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c} \subseteq$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle$ when :

(α) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$

(β) $\bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda = \langle \mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ witness ps-tcf$(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, <_{J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak{a}]})$.

3) Above $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ is closed when $\mathfrak{b}_\lambda = \mathfrak{a} \cap$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda)$.
3A) Above $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ is smooth when $\theta \in \mathfrak{b}_\lambda \Rightarrow \mathfrak{b}_\theta \subseteq \mathfrak{b}_\lambda$.
4) We say above is $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ full when $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{a} \cap$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Remark 2.10. 1) Note that 1.7 gives sufficient conditions for the existence of $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ as in 2.9(1).
2) Of course, Definition 2.9 is interesting particularly when $\mathfrak{a} =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Proof. Proof of 2.8

$(*)_1$ $\mathfrak{c} =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{c})$.

[Why? By 2.7 using $\text{AC}_{\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{a})}$.]

$(*)_2$ there is a generating sequence $\langle \mathfrak{b}_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$ for $\mathfrak{a}$.

[Why? By 1.7(3) using also $\text{AC}_{\mathfrak{c}}$.]

$(*)_3$ let $\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{b}_\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}$.

$(*)_4$ (*a*) $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}^* = \langle \mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$ is well defined

(*b*) $\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$

(*c*) $\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda =$ ps-pcf$_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda)$

(*d*) $\lambda = \max(\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda)$.

[Why? First, $\bar{\mathfrak b}^*$ is well defined as $\bar{\mathfrak b} = \langle \mathfrak b_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak c\rangle$ is well defined. Second, $\mathfrak b^*_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak c$ as $\mathfrak b_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak a$ hence $\mathfrak b^*_\lambda = \text{ ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak b^*_\lambda) \subseteq \text{ ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak a) = \mathfrak c$. Third, $\mathfrak b^*_\lambda = \text{ ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak b^*_\lambda)$ by Conclusion 2.7, it is easy to check that its assumption holds recalling $\mathfrak b_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak a$. Fourth, $\lambda \in \mathfrak b^*_\lambda$ as $J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak a]$ witness $\mathfrak b^*_\lambda = \text{ ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak b_\lambda) \subseteq \lambda^+$ as $\mathfrak b_\lambda \in J_{<\lambda^+}[\mathfrak a]$ and lastly, $\max(\mathfrak b^*_\lambda) = \lambda$ by $(*)_2$.]

We can now choose $\bar{\mathscr F}$ such that

$(*)_5$ (a) $\bar{\mathscr F} = \langle \bar{\mathscr F}_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak c\rangle$
(b) $\bar{\mathscr F}_\lambda = \langle \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$
(c) $\bar{\mathscr F}_\lambda$ witness $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak a, <_{J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak a]})$
(d) if $\lambda \in \mathfrak a, \alpha < \lambda$ and $f \in \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha}$ then $f(\lambda) = \alpha$.

[Why? For each λ there is such $\bar{\mathscr F}$ as $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak a, <_{J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak a]})$. But we are assuming $\text{AC}_{\mathfrak c}$ and for clause (d) it is easy; in fact it is enough to use $\text{AC}_{\mathscr P(\mathfrak a)}$ and h as in 2.7, getting $\langle \bar{\mathscr F}_{\mathfrak b} : \mathfrak b \in \mathscr P(\mathfrak a)\rangle, \bar{\mathscr F}_{\mathfrak b}$ witness $h(\mathfrak b) = \text{ ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak a, <_{J_{=\lambda}} [\mathfrak a])$ and putting $\langle \bar{\mathscr F}_{\mathfrak b} : \mathfrak b \in h^{-1}\{\lambda\}\rangle$ together for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak c$.]

$(*)_6$ (a) for $\lambda \in \mathfrak c$ and $f \in \Pi\mathfrak b_\lambda$ let $f^{[\lambda]} \in \Pi\mathfrak b^*_\lambda$ be defined by: $f^{[\lambda]}(\theta) =$
$\min\{\alpha < \lambda$: for every $g \in \mathscr F_{\theta,\alpha}$ we have
$f{\restriction}\mathfrak b_\lambda \le (g{\restriction}\mathfrak b_\lambda) \bmod J_{=\theta}[\mathfrak b_\lambda]\}$
(b) for $\lambda \in \mathfrak c$ and $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\mathscr F^{[*]}_{\lambda,\alpha} = \{f^{[\lambda]} : f \in \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha}\}$.

Now

$(*)_7$ (a) $f^{[\lambda]}{\restriction}\mathfrak a \ge f$ for $f \in \Pi\mathfrak b_\lambda, \lambda \in \mathfrak c$
(b) $\langle \mathscr F^*_{\lambda,\alpha} : \lambda \in \mathfrak c, \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ is well defined (hence exist)
(c) $\mathscr F^*_{\lambda,\alpha} \subseteq \Pi\mathfrak b^*_\lambda$.

[Why? Obvious.]

$(*)_8$ let J_λ be the $\aleph_1$-complete ideal on $\mathfrak b^*_\lambda$ generated by $\{\mathfrak b^*_\theta \cap \mathfrak b^*_\lambda : \theta \in \mathfrak c \cap \lambda\}$
$(*)_9$ $J_\lambda \subseteq J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\mathfrak b^*_\lambda]$.

[Why? As for $\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_n \ldots \in \mathfrak c \cap \lambda$ we have $\text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}(\cup\{\mathfrak b^*_{\theta_n} : n < \omega\}) = \cup\{\mathfrak b^*_{\theta_n} : n < \omega\} \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}$.]

$\odot_1$ if $\lambda \in \mathfrak c$ and $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \lambda$ and $f_\ell \in \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $f^{[\lambda]}_1 \le f^{[\lambda]}_2 \bmod J_\lambda$.

[Why? Let $\mathfrak a_* = \{\theta \in \mathfrak b_\lambda : f_1(\sigma) \ge f_2(\theta)\}$, hence by the assumption on $\langle \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ we have $\mathfrak a_* \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{<\lambda}[\mathfrak a]$, hence we can find a seqauence $\langle \theta_n : n < \mathbf n \le \omega\rangle$ such that $\theta_n \in \mathfrak c \cap \lambda$ and $\mathfrak a_* \subseteq \mathfrak b_* := \cup\{\mathfrak b_{\theta_n} : n < \mathbf n\}$ hence $\mathfrak c_* = \text{ps-pcf}_{\aleph_1-\text{com}}(\mathfrak a_*) \subseteq \cup\{\mathfrak b^*_{\theta_n} : n < \mathbf n\} \in J_\lambda$. So it suffices to prove $f^{[\lambda]}_1{\restriction}(\mathfrak b^*_\lambda \backslash \mathfrak c_*) \le f^{[\lambda]}_2{\restriction}(\mathfrak b^*_\lambda \backslash \mathfrak c_*)$, so let $\theta \in \mathfrak b^*_\lambda \backslash \bigcup\limits_n \mathfrak b^*_{\theta_n}$ clearly $\theta \le \lambda$, let $\alpha := f^{[\lambda]}_2(\theta)$, so $(\forall g \in \mathscr F_{\theta,\alpha})(f_2{\restriction}\mathfrak b_\lambda) \le (g{\restriction}\mathfrak b_\lambda) \bmod J_{=\theta}[\mathfrak b_\lambda])$ but $\mathfrak a_* \in J^{\aleph_1-\text{comp}}_{=\theta}[\mathfrak b_\lambda]$ so $(f_1{\restriction}\mathfrak b_*) \le (f_2{\restriction}\mathfrak b_*) \le (g{\restriction}\mathfrak b_*) \bmod J_{=\theta}[\mathfrak b_*]$ hence $f^{[\lambda]}_1(\theta) \le \alpha = f^{[\lambda]}_2(\theta)$. So we are done.]

$\odot_2$ if $\lambda \in \mathfrak c$ and $g \in \Pi\mathfrak b^*_\lambda$ then for some $\alpha < \lambda$ and $f \in \mathscr F_{\lambda,\alpha}$ we have $g < f \bmod J_\lambda$.

[Why? We choose $\langle h_\theta : \theta \in \mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda\rangle$ such that $h_\theta \in \mathscr{F}_{\theta,g(\theta)}$ for each $\theta \in \mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda$. Let $h_1 \in \Pi\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda$ be defined by $h_1(\kappa) = \sup\{h^{[\lambda]}_\theta(\kappa) : \kappa \in \mathfrak{b}_\theta \text{ and } \theta \in \mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda\}$ hence there are $\alpha < \lambda$ and $h_2 \in \mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ such that $h_1 \le h_2 \mod J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak{a}]$. Now $f := h^{[\lambda]}_2 \in \Pi\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda$ is as required.]

$\odot_3$ $\mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha}$ witness $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda, <_{J_\lambda})$.

[Why? In $(*)_7 + \odot_1 + \odot_2$.]

So

$\odot_4$ $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}^* = \langle \mathfrak{b}^*_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$ is a generating sequence for $\mathfrak{c}$.

[Why? Check.] $\square_{2.8}$

Remark 2.11. Clearly $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}^*$ is closed, but what about smoooth? Is this necessary for generalizing [Sh:460]?

Discussion 2.12. Naturally the definition now of $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ as in 2.9(2) for $\Pi\mathfrak{a}$ is more involved where $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda : \lambda \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\kappa-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle, \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda = \langle \mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ exemplifies $\text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, J_{=\lambda}(\mathfrak{a}))$.

Claim 2.13. *Assume*

(*a*) $\mathfrak{a}$ *a set of regular cardinals*

(*b*) κ *is regular* $> \aleph_0$

(*c*) $\mathfrak{c} = \text{ps-pcf}_{\kappa-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})$

(*d*) $\min(\mathfrak{a})$ *is* $\ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{c}))$ *or at least* $\ge \text{hrtg}(\mathfrak{c})$

(*e*) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle, \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\lambda = \langle \mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *witness* $\lambda = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, <_{J^{\kappa-\text{comp}}_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak{a}]})$.

Then

$\boxplus$ *for every* $f \in \Pi\mathfrak{a}$ *for some* $g \in \Pi\mathfrak{c}$, *if* $g \le g_1 \in \Pi\mathfrak{c}$ *and* $\bar{h} \in \Pi\{\mathscr{F}_{\lambda,g_1(\lambda)} : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\}$ *then* $(\exists\mathfrak{d} \in [\mathfrak{c}]^{<\kappa})(f < \sup\{h_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{d}\})$.

Proof. Let $f \in \Pi\mathfrak{a}$. For each $\lambda \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\kappa-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})$ let $\alpha_{f,\lambda} = \min\{\alpha < \lambda : f < g \mod J_{=\lambda}[\mathfrak{a}] \text{ for every } g \in \mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha}\}$ so clearly each α_f is well defined hence $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_{f,\lambda} : \lambda \in \text{ps-pcf}_{\kappa-\text{com}}(\mathfrak{a})\rangle$ exists. Let $\langle g_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$ be any sequence from $\Pi\mathscr{F}_{\lambda,\alpha_{f,\lambda}}$ at least one exists when $\text{AC}_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_{f,\lambda} = \{\theta \in \mathfrak{a} : f(\theta) < g_\lambda(\theta)\}$ so $\langle \mathfrak{a}_{f,\lambda} : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\rangle$ exists and we claim that for some $\mathfrak{d} \in [\mathfrak{c}]^{<\kappa}$ we have $\mathfrak{a} = \cup\{a_{f,\lambda} : \lambda \in \mathfrak{d}\}$. Otherwise let J be the κ-complete ideal on $\mathfrak{a}$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{a}_{f,\lambda} : \lambda \in \mathfrak{c}\}$, it is a κ-complete ideal. So the "no-hole claim", 1.12 applicable by our assumptions there is a κ-complete ideal J on $\mathfrak{a}$ extending J such that $\lambda_* = \text{ps-tcf}(\Pi\mathfrak{a}, <_{J_1})$ is well defined. So $\lambda_* \in \mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_{f,\lambda_*} \in J_1$, easy contradiction. $\square_{2.13}$

§ 3. MEASURING REDUCED PRODUCTS

§ 3(A). On ps-$\mathbf{T}_D(g)$.

Now we consider some ways to measure the size of ${}^\kappa\mu/D$ and show that they essentially are equal; see Discussion 3.9.

Definition 3.1. Let $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_y : y \in Y\rangle \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$ be such that $t \in Y \Rightarrow \alpha_t > 0$.
1) For D a filter on Y let ps-$\mathbf{T}_D(\bar\alpha) = \sup\{\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathbf{F}) : \mathbf{F}$ is a family of non-empty subsets of $\Pi\bar\alpha$ such that for every $\mathscr{F}_1 \neq \mathscr{F}_2$ from $\mathbf{F}$ we have $f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_1 \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_2 \Rightarrow f_1 \neq_D f_2\}$, recalling $f_1 \neq_D f_2$ means $\{y \in Y : f_1(y) \neq f_2(y)\} \in D$.
2) Let ps-$\mathbf{T}_{\kappa-\mathrm{comp}}(\bar\alpha) = \sup\{\mathrm{hrtg}(\mathbf{F})$: for some κ-complete filter D on Y, $\mathbf{F}$ is as above for $D\}$.
3) If we allow $\alpha_t = 0$ just replace $\Pi\bar\alpha$ by $\Pi^*\bar\alpha := \{f : f \in \prod\limits_t(\alpha_t + 1)$ and $\{t : f(t) = \alpha_t\} = \emptyset \bmod D\}$.

Theorem 3.2. *[DC + AC$_{\mathscr{P}(Y)}$] Assume that D is a κ-complete filter on Y and $\kappa > \aleph_0$ and $g \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Ord}\setminus\{0\})$, if g is constantly α we may write α. The following cardinals are equal* *or* *at least $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are $\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)$-almost equal which means: for $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \{1,2,3\}$ we have $\lambda_{\ell_1} \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_S \lambda_{\ell_2}$ which means if $\alpha < \lambda_{\ell_1}$ then α is included in the union of S sets each of order type $< \lambda_{\ell_2}$:*

- (a) $\lambda_1 = \sup\{|\mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(g)|^+ : D_1 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)\}$
- (b) $\lambda_2 = \sup\{\lambda^+$: *there are* $D_1 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)$ *and a* $<_{D_1}$*-increasing sequence* $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *such that* $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \prod\limits_{y\in Y} g(y)$ *is non-empty*$\}$
- (c) $\lambda_3 = \sup\{\mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{D_1}(g) : D_1 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)\}$.

Remark 3.3. 1) Recall that for D a κ-complete filter on Y we let $\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D) = \{E : E$ is a κ-complete filter on Y extending $D\}$.
2) The conclusion gives slightly less than equality of $\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \lambda_3$.
3) See 3.10(6) below, by it $\lambda_2 = \text{ps-Depth}^+({}^\kappa\mu, <_D)$.
4) We may replace κ-complete by $(\le Z)$-complete if $\aleph_0 \le |Z|$.
5) Compare with Definition 3.10.
6) Note that those cardinals are $\le \mathrm{hrtg}(\Pi^* g)$.

Proof. Stage A: $\lambda_1 \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_{\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)} \lambda_2, \lambda_3$.

Why? Let $\chi < \lambda_1$, so by clause (a) there is $D_1 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)$ such that $\mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(g) \ge \chi$. Let $X_{D_2} = \{\alpha < \chi$: some $f \in \prod\limits_{y\in Y} g(y)$ satisfies $D_2 = \mathrm{dual}(J[f, D_1])$ and $\alpha = \mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(f)\}$, for any $D_2 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D_1)$. By [Sh:938, 1.11(5)] we have $\chi = \bigcup\{X_{D_2} : D_2 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D_1)\}$.

Now

$\odot$ $D_2 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D_1) \Rightarrow |\mathrm{otp}(X_{D_2})| < \lambda_2, \lambda_3$; this is enough.

Why? Letting $\mathscr{F}_{D_2,i} = \{f \in {}^Y\mu : \mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(f) = i$ and $J[f, D_1] = \mathrm{dual}(D_2)\}$, by [Sh:938, 1.11(2)] we have: $i < j \wedge i \in X_{D_2} \wedge j \in X_{D_2} \wedge f \in \mathscr{F}_{D_2,i} \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}_{D_2,j} \Rightarrow f < g \bmod D_2$ so $\mathrm{otp}(X_{D_2}) < \lambda_2, \lambda_3$.

Stage B: $\lambda_2 \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_{\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)} \lambda_1, \lambda_3$.

Why? Let $\chi < \lambda_2$ and let D_1 and $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \chi\rangle$ exemplify $\chi < \lambda_2$. Let $\gamma_\alpha = \min\{\mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(f) : f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha\}$ so easily $\alpha < \beta < \chi \Rightarrow \gamma_\alpha < \gamma_\beta$ hence $\mathrm{rk}_D(g) \ge \chi$.

So $\chi < \lambda_1$ and as for $\chi < \lambda_3$ this holds by Definition 3.1(2) as $\alpha < \beta \wedge f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}_\beta \Rightarrow f < g \mod D_1 \Rightarrow f \neq g \mod D_1$ as $\chi^+ = \mathrm{hrtg}(\chi) \le \lambda_3$.

Stage C: $\lambda_3 \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_{\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)} \lambda_1, \lambda_2$.

Why? Let $\chi < \lambda_3$. Let $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ exemplify $\chi < \lambda_3$. For each $\alpha < \chi$ let $\mathbf{D}_\alpha = \{\mathrm{dual}(J[f,D]) : f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha\}$ so a non-empty subset of $\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(Y)$. Now for every $D_1 \in \cup\{\mathbf{D}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ let $X_{D_1} = \{\alpha < \chi : D_1 \in \mathbf{D}_\alpha\}$ and for $\alpha \in X_{D_1}$ let $\zeta_{D_1,\alpha} = \min\{\mathrm{rk}_D(f) : f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and $D_1 = \mathrm{dual}(J[f,D])\}$ and let $\mathscr{F}_{D_1,\alpha} = \{f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha : D_1 = J[f,D]$ and $\mathrm{rk}_D(f) = \zeta_{D_1,\alpha}\}$ so a non-empty subset of $\mathscr{F}_\alpha$ and clearly $\langle (\zeta_{D_1,\alpha}, \mathscr{F}_{D_1,\alpha}) : \alpha \in X_{D_1} \rangle$ exists.

Now

- (a) $\alpha \mapsto \zeta_{D_1,\alpha}$ is a one-to-one function with domain X_{D_1}
- (b) $\chi = \cup\{X_{D_1} : D_1 \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(Y)\}$
- (c) if $\alpha < \beta$ are from X_{D_1} and $\zeta_{D_1,\alpha} < \zeta_{D_1,\beta}, f \in \mathscr{F}_{D_1,\alpha}, g \in \mathscr{F}_{D_2,\beta}$ then $f < g \mod D_1$.

[Why? For clause (a), if $\alpha \neq \beta \in X_{\zeta_1}, f \in \mathscr{F}_{D_1,\alpha}, g \in \mathscr{F}_{D_1,\beta}$ then $f \neq g \mod D$ hence by [Sh:938, 1.11] we have $\zeta_{D_1,\alpha} \neq \zeta_{D_1,\beta}$. For clause (b), it follows by the choices of $\mathbf{D}_\alpha, X_{D_1}$. Lastly, clause (c) follows by [Sh:938, 1.11(2)].]

Hence (by clause (c))

- (d) $\mathrm{otp}(X_{D_1})$ is $< \lambda_2$ and is $\le \mathrm{rk}_{D_1}(g)$ for $D_1 \in \cup\{\mathbf{D}_\alpha : \alpha < \chi\} \subseteq \mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D)$.

Together clauses (b),(d) show that $\chi < \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ so we are done. $\square_{3.2}$

Observation 3.4. Assume D is a filter on Y and $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Ord}\backslash\{0\})$.
1) $\mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\bar{\alpha}) = \sup\{\lambda^+$: there is a sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}, \mathscr{F}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $\alpha \neq \beta \wedge f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_\beta \Rightarrow f_1 \neq_D f_2\}$.

Proof. 1) Clearly the new definition gives a cardinal $\le \mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\bar{\alpha})$. For the other inequality assume $\lambda < \mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\bar{\alpha})$ so there is $\mathbf{F}$ as there such that $\lambda < \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathbf{F})$. As $\lambda < \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathbf{F})$ there is a function h from $\mathbf{F}$ onto λ. For $\alpha < \lambda$ define $\mathscr{F}'_\alpha = \cup\{\mathscr{F} : \mathscr{F} \in \mathbf{F}$ and $h(\mathscr{F}) = \alpha\}$. So $\langle \mathscr{F}'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exists and is as required. $\square$

Concerning Theorem 3.2 we may wonder "when does λ_1, λ_2 being S-almost equal implies they are equal".

Definition 3.5. 1) We say "the power of $\mathscr{U}_1$ is S-almost smaller than the power of $\mathscr{U}_2$", or write $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le |\mathscr{U}_2| \mod S$ or $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$ when: we can find a sequence $\langle u_{1,s} : s \in S \rangle$ such that $\mathscr{U}_1 = \cup\{u_{1,s} : s \in S\}$ and $s \in S \Rightarrow |\mathscr{U}_{1,s}| \le |\mathscr{U}_2|$.
2) We say the power $|\mathscr{U}_1|, |\mathscr{U}_2|$ are S-almost equal (or $|\mathscr{U}_1| = |\mathscr{U}_2| \mod S$ or $|\mathscr{U}_1| =^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$) when $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2| \le^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$.
3) Let $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le^{\mathrm{alm}}_{<S} |\mathscr{U}_2|$ be defined naturally.
4) In particular this applies to cardinals.
5) Let $|\mathscr{U}_1| <^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$ means there is a sequence $\langle u_{1,s} : s \in S \rangle$ with union $\mathscr{U}_1$ such that $s \in S \Rightarrow |\mathscr{U}_s| < |\mathscr{U}_2|$.
6) Let $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$ means that if $|\mathscr{U}| < |\mathscr{U}_1|$ then $|\mathscr{U}| <^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$.

Observation 3.6. 1) If $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le |\mathscr{U}_2|$ and $S \neq \emptyset$ then $|\mathscr{U}_1| \le^{\mathrm{alm}}_S |\mathscr{U}_2|$.
2) If $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$ and $S \neq \emptyset$ then $\lambda_1 \le^{\mathrm{sal}}_S \lambda_2$.

Proof. Immediate. $\square_{3.6}$

Observation 3.7. 1) The cardinals λ_1, λ_2 are equal when $\lambda_1 =^{\rm alm}_S \lambda_2$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda_1)$, $\text{cf}(\lambda_2) \ge \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$.
2) The cardinals λ_1, λ_2 are equal when $\lambda_1 =^{\rm alm}_S \lambda_2$ and λ_1, λ_2 are limit cardinals $> \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$.
3) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_S \lambda_2$ and $\partial = \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$ then $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\partial} \lambda_2$.
4) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda_1) \ge \theta$ then $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$.
5) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\theta \le \lambda_2^+$ then $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2^+$.

Proof. 1) Otherwise, let $\partial = \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$, without loss of generality $\lambda_2 < \lambda_1$ and by part (3) we have $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\partial} \lambda_2$ and by part (4) we have $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$ contradiction.
2) Otherwise letting $\partial = \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$ without loss of generality $\lambda_2 < \lambda_1$ and by part (3) we have $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\partial} \lambda_2$ but $\theta < \lambda_2$ is assume and $\lambda_2^+ < \lambda_1$ as λ_2 is a limit cardinal so together we get contradiction to part (5).
3) If $\langle u_s : S \in S\rangle$ witness $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_S \lambda_2$, let $w = \{\alpha < \lambda_1$: for no $\beta < \alpha$ do we have $(\forall s \in S)(\alpha \in u_s \equiv \beta \in u_s)\}$ so clearly $|w| < \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S)) = \theta$ and for $\alpha \in w$ let $v_\alpha = \{\beta < \lambda_1 : (\forall s \in S)(\alpha \in u_s \equiv \beta \in u_s)\}$ so $\langle v_\alpha : \alpha \in w\rangle$ witness $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_w \lambda_2$ hence $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$.
4),5) Let $\sigma < \theta$ be such that $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_\sigma \lambda_2$ and let $\langle u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma\rangle$ witness $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm alm}_\sigma \lambda_2$, that is $|u_\varepsilon| \le \lambda_2$ for $\varepsilon < \sigma$ and $\cup\{u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma\} = \lambda_1$.

For part (4), if $\lambda_2 < \lambda_1$, then we have $\varepsilon < \sigma \Rightarrow |u_\varepsilon| < \lambda_1$, but $\text{cf}(\lambda_1) > \sigma$ hence $|\{\cup\{u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma\} < \lambda_1|$, contradiction.

For part (5) for $\varepsilon < \sigma$, let $u'_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon \backslash \cup \{u_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$ and so $\text{otp}(u'_\varepsilon) \le \text{otp}(u_\varepsilon) < |u_\varepsilon|^+ \le \lambda_2^+$ so easily $|\lambda_1| = |\cup\{u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma\}| = |\cup\{u'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma\}| \le \sigma \cdot \lambda_2^+ \le \lambda_2^+ \cdot \lambda_2^+ = \lambda_2^+$. $\square_{3.7}$

Similarly

Observation 3.8. 1) If $\lambda_1 <^{\rm alm}_S \lambda_2$ and $\partial = \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$ then $\lambda_1 <^{\rm alm}_{<\partial} \lambda_2$.
2) If $\lambda_1 <^{\rm alm}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda_1) \ge \theta$ then $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$.
3) If $\lambda_1 <^{\rm alm}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\theta \le \lambda_2^+$ then $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$.
4) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm sal}_S \lambda_2$ and $\partial = \text{hrtg}(\mathscr{P}(S))$ then $\lambda_1 <^{\rm sal}_{<\partial} \lambda_2$.
5) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm sal}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\partial \le \lambda_2^+, \theta < \lambda_2$ and $\text{cf}(\lambda_2) \ge \theta$ then $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2$.
6) If $\lambda_1 \le^{\rm sal}_{<\theta} \lambda_2$ and $\theta \le \lambda_2^+$ then $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2^+$.

Discussion 3.9. 1) We like to measure $({}^Y\mu)/D$ in some ways and show their equivalence, as was done in ZFC. Natural candidates are:

- (A) $\text{pp}_D(\mu)$: say of length of increasing sequence $\bar P$ (not $\bar p$!, i.e. sets) ordered by $<_D$
- (B) $\text{pp}^+_Y(\mu) = \sup\{\text{pp}^+_D(\mu) : D$ an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on $Y\}$
- (C) As in 3.1.

2) We may measure ${}^Y\mu$ by considering all ∂-complete filters.
3) We may be more lenient in defining "same cardinality". E.g.

- (A) we define when sets have similar powers say by divisions to $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$ sets we measure $({}^Y\mu)/\approx_{\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(Y))}$ where $\approx_B$ is the following equivalence relation on sets:
  $X \approx_B Y$ when we can find sequences $\langle X_b : b \in B\rangle, \langle Y_b : b \in B\rangle$
  such that:
  - (a) $X = \cup\{X_b : b \in B\}$

(b) $Y = \cup\{Y_b : b \in B\}$

(c) $|X_b| = |Y_b|$

(B) we may demand more: the $\langle X_b : b \in B\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint and the $\langle Y_b : b \in B\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint

(C) we may demand less: e.g.

(c)′ $|X_b| \le_* |Y_b| \le_* |X_b|$
and/or

(c)$_*$ $(\forall b \in B)(\exists c \in B)(|X_b| \le |Y_c|)$ and
$(\forall b \in B)(\exists c \in B)(|Y_b| \le |X_c|)$.

Note that some of the main results of [Sh:835] can be expressed this way.

(D) $\text{rk-sup}_{Y,\partial}(\mu) = \text{rk-sup}\ \{\text{rk}_D(\mu) : D \text{ is } \partial\text{-complete filters on } Y\}$

(E) for each non-empty $X \subseteq {}^Y\mu$ let

$$\text{sp}^1_\alpha(X) = \{(D, J) : D \text{ an } \aleph_1\text{-complete filter on } Y, J = J[f, D], \alpha = \text{ rk}_D(f) \text{ and } f \in X\}$$

$$\text{sp}_1(X) = \cup\{\text{sp}^1_\alpha(X) : \alpha\}$$

(F) question: If $\{\text{sp}(X_s) : s \in S\}$ is constant, can we bound J?

(G) X, Y are called connected when $\text{sp}(X_1), \text{sp}(X_2))$ are non-disjoint or equal.

4) We hope to prove, at least sometimes $\gamma := \Upsilon({}^Y\mu) \le \text{pp}_\kappa(\mu)$ that is we like to immitate [Sh:835] without the choice axioms on ${}^\omega\mu$. So there is $\bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ witnessing $\gamma < \Upsilon({}^Y\mu)$. We define $u = u_{\bar f} = \{\alpha$: there is no $\bar\beta \in {}^\omega\alpha$ such that $(\forall it \in Y)(f_\alpha(t) \in \{f_{\beta_n}(t) : n < \omega\})$. You may say that $u_{\bar f}$ is the set of $\alpha < \delta$ such that f_α is "really novel".

By DC this is O.K., i.e.

$\boxplus_1$ for every $\alpha < \delta$ there is $\bar\beta \in {}^\omega(u_{\bar f} \cap \alpha)$ such that $(\forall t \in Y)(f_\alpha(t)) = \{f_{\beta_n}(t) : n < \omega\}$.

Next for $\alpha \in u_{\bar f}$ we can define $D_{\bar f,\alpha}$, the $\aleph_1$-complete filter on Y generated by $\Big\{\{t \in Y : f_\beta(t) = f_\alpha(t)\} : \beta < \alpha\Big\}$. So clearly $\alpha \ne \beta \in u_{\bar f} \wedge D_{\bar f,\alpha} = D_{\bar f,\beta} \Rightarrow f_\alpha \ne_D f_\beta$. Now for each pair $\bar D = (D_1, D_2) \in \text{ Fil}^4_Y$ (i.e. for the $\aleph_1$-complete case) let $\Lambda_{\bar f,\bar D} = \{\alpha \in u_{\bar f} : D_{\bar f,\alpha} = D_1 \text{ and } J[f_\alpha, D_1]\} = \text{ dual}(D_2)$. So γ is the union of $\le \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(Y))$-sets (as $|Y| = |Y| \times |Y|$, well ordered.

So

$(*)_1$ $\gamma \le \text{hrtg}(({}^Y\omega \times {}^\omega(\mu))$

$(*)_2$ u is the union of $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{P}(\kappa))$-sets each of cardinality $< \text{ pp}^+_{Y,\aleph_1}(\mu)$

(I) what about $\text{hrtg}({}^\kappa\mu) < \text{ ps-pp}_{Y,\aleph_1}(\mu)$?

We are given $\langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle \ne F_\alpha \ne \emptyset, \mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \mu, \alpha \ne \beta \Rightarrow \mathscr{F}_\alpha \cap \mathscr{F}_\beta = \emptyset$.

Easier: looking modulo a fix filter D.

$(*)_2$ for $D \in \text{ Fil}_{Y,\aleph_1}$, let $\mathscr{F}_{\alpha,D} = \{f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \neg(\exists g \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha)(g <_D f)\}$.

Maybe we have somewhere a bound on the size of $\mathscr{F}_{\alpha,D}$.

§ 3(B). **Depth of Reduced Power of Ordinals.**

Our intention has been to generalize a relative of [Sh:460], but actually we are closed to [Sh:513, §3] using IND but unlike [Sh:938] rather than with rank we deal with depth.

Definition 3.10. 1) Let $\mathrm{suc}_X(\alpha)$ be the first ordinal β such that we cannot find a sequence $\langle \mathscr{U}_x : x \in X\rangle$ of subsets of β, each of order type $< \alpha$ such that $\beta = \cup\{\mathscr{U}_x : x \in X\}$.
2) We define $\mathrm{suc}^{[\varepsilon]}_X(\alpha)$ by induction on ε naturally: if $\varepsilon = 0$ it is α, if $\varepsilon = \zeta + 1$ it is $\mathrm{suc}_X(\mathrm{suc}^{[\zeta]}_X(\alpha))$ and if ε is a limit ordinal then it is $\cup\{\mathrm{suc}^{[\zeta]}_X(\alpha) : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$.
3) For a quasi-order P let the pseudo ordinal depth of P, denoted by ps-o-Depth(P) be $\sup\{\gamma$: there is a $<_P$-increasing sequence $\langle X_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\rangle$ of non-empty subsets of $P\}$.
4) o-Depth(P) is defined similarly demanding $|X_\alpha| = 1$ for $\alpha < \gamma$.
5) Omitting the "ordinal" means γ is replaced by $|\gamma|$; similarly in the other variants.
6) Let $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+(P) = \sup\{\gamma + 1$: there is an increasing sequence $\langle X_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\rangle$ of non-empty subsets of $P\}$. Similarly for the other variants, e.g. without o we use $|\gamma|^+$ instead of $\gamma + 1$ in the supremum.
7) For D a filter on Y and $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y(\mathrm{Ord}\setminus\{0\})$ let $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+_D(\bar\alpha) = \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\Pi\bar\alpha, <_D)$. Similarly for the other variants and we may allow $\alpha_t = 0$ as in 3.1(3).
8) Let $\text{ps-o-depth}^+_D(\bar\alpha)$ be the cardinality of $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+_D(\bar\alpha)$.

Remark 3.11. Note that 1.13 can be phrased using this definition.

Definition 3.12. 0) We say $\mathbf{x}$ is a filter ω-sequence when $\mathbf{x} = \langle (Y_n, D_n) : n < \omega\rangle = \langle Y_{\mathbf{x},n}, D_{\mathbf{x},n} : n < \omega\rangle$ is such that D_n is a filter on Y_n for each $n < \omega$; we may omit Y_n as it is $\cup\{Y : Y \in D\}$ and may write D if $\bigwedge\limits_n D_n = D$.
1) Let $\mathrm{IND}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}$ has the independence property, means that for every sequence $\bar F = \langle F_{m,n} : m < n < \omega\rangle$ from $\mathrm{alg}(\mathbf{x})$, see below, there is $\bar t \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} Y_n$ such that $m < n < \omega \Rightarrow t_m \notin F_{m,n}(\bar t{\restriction}(m, n])$. Let $\mathrm{NIND}(\mathbf{x})$ be the negation.
2) Let $\mathrm{alg}(\mathbf{x})$ be the set of sequence $\langle F_{n,m} : n < m < \omega\rangle$ such that $F_{m,n} : \prod\limits_{\ell=m+1}^{n} Y_\ell \to \mathrm{dual}(D_n)$.
3) We say $\mathbf{x}$ is κ-complete when each $D_{\mathbf{x},n}$ is a κ-complete filter.

Theorem 3.13. *Assume* $\mathrm{IND}(\mathbf{x})$ *where* $\mathbf{x} = \langle (Y_n, D_n) : n < \omega\rangle$ *is as in Definition 3.12,* D_n *is* κ_n*-complete,* $\kappa_n \geq \aleph_1$.
*1) [*DC + AC_{Y_n} *for* $n < \omega$*] For every ordinal* ζ*, for infinitely many n's* ps-o-Depth$({}^{(Y_n)}\zeta, <_{D_n}) \leq \zeta$.
*2) [*DC*] For every ordinal* ζ *for infinitely many n,* o-Depth$({}^{(Y_n)}\zeta, <_{D_n}) \leq \zeta$*, equivalently there is no* $<_{D_n}$*-increasing sequence of length* $\zeta + 1$.

Remark 3.14. 0) Note that the present results are incomparable with [Sh:938, §4] - the loss is using depth instead of rank and possibly using "pseudo".
1) [Assume $\mathrm{AC}_{\aleph_0}$] If in 3.13, for every n we have $\mathrm{rk}_{D_n}(\zeta) > \mathrm{suc}_{\mathrm{Fil}^1_\kappa(D_n)}(\zeta)$ then for some $D^1_n \in \mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(Y_n)$ for $n < \omega$ we have $\mathrm{NIND}(\langle Y_n, D^1_n) : n < \omega\rangle$. (Why? By [Sh:938, 5.9]). But we do not know much on the D^1_n's.

2) This theorem applies to e.g. $\zeta = \aleph_\omega, Y_n = \aleph_n, D_n =$ dual$(J^{\rm bd}_{\aleph_n})$. So even in ZFC, it tells us things not covered by [Sh:513, §3]. Note that Depth and pcf are closely connected but only for sequences of length $\ge$ hrtg$(\mathscr{P}(Y))$.
3) If we assume IND$(\langle Y_{\eta(n)}, D_{\eta(n)} : n < \omega\rangle$ for every increasing $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$, which is quite reasonable then in Theorem 3.13 we can strengthen the conclusion, replacing "for infinitely many n's" by "for every $n < \omega$ large enough".
4) Note that 3.13(2) is complimentary to [Sh:835].

Observation 3.15. If $\mathbf{x}$ is a filter ω-sequence and $n_* < \omega$ and IND$(\mathbf{x}\restriction[n_*,\omega)$ then IND$(\mathbf{x})$.

Proof. Let $\bar F = \langle F_{n,m} : n < m < \omega\rangle \in$ alg$(\mathbf{x})$, so $\langle F_{n,m} : n \in [n_*,\omega)$ and $m \in (n,\omega)\rangle$ belongs to alg$(\mathbf{x}\restriction[n_*,\omega)$ hence by the assumption "IND$(\mathbf{x}\restriction[n_*,\omega))$ there is $\bar t = \langle t_n : n \in [n_*,\omega)\rangle \in \prod\limits_{n \ge n_*} Y_n$ such that $t_n \notin F_{n,m}(\bar t\restriction(n,m))$ when $n_* \le n < \omega$. Now by downward induction on $n < n_*$ we choose $t_n \in Y_n$ such that $t_n \notin F_{n,m}(\langle t_k : k \in [n+1,m])$ for $m \in [n+1,\omega)$. This is possible as the countable union of members of dual(D_n) is not equal to Y_n. We can carry the induction and $\langle t_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is as required to verify IND$(\mathbf{x})$. $\square_{3.15}$

Proof. Proof of Theorem 3.13

We concentrate on proving part (1), part (2) is easier.

Assume this fails. So for some $n_* < \omega$ for every $n \in [n_*,\omega)$ there is a counterexample. As AC$_{\aleph_0}$ holds we can find a sequence $\langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}_n : n \in [n_*,\omega)\rangle$ such that:

- $\odot$ for $n \in [n_*,\omega)$
  - (a) $\bar{\mathscr{F}}_n = \langle \mathscr{F}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \le \zeta\rangle$
  - (b) $\mathscr{F}_{n,\varepsilon} \subseteq {}^{Y_n}\zeta$ is non-empty
  - (c) $\bar{\mathscr{F}}_n$ is a $<_{D_n}$-increasing sequence of sets, i.e. $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 \le \zeta \wedge f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{n,\varepsilon_1} \wedge f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_{n,\varepsilon_2} \Rightarrow f_1 <_{D_n} f_2$.

Now by AC$_{\aleph_0}$ we can choose $\langle f_n : n \in [n_*,\omega)\rangle$ such that $f_n \in \mathscr{F}_{n,\zeta}$ for $n \in [n_*,\omega)$.

- $(*)$ without loss of generality $n_* = 0$.

[Why? As $\mathbf{x}\restriction[n_*,\omega)$ satisfies the assumptions on $\mathbf{x}$ by 3.15.]

Let

- $\boxplus_1$ for $m \le n < \omega$ let $Y^0_{m,n} = \prod\limits_{\ell=m}^{n-1} Y_\ell$ and for $m,n < \omega$ let $Y^1_{m,n} := \cup\{Y^0_{k,n} : k \in [m,n]\}$ so $Y^0_{m,n} = \emptyset = Y^1_{m,n}$ if $m > n$ and $Y^0_{m,n} = \{<>\} = Y^1_{m,n}$ if $m = n$
- $\boxplus_2$ for $m \le n$ let $\mathscr{G}^1_{m,n}$ be the set of functions g such that:
  - (a) g is a function from $Y^1_{m,n}$ into $\zeta + 1$
  - (b) $\langle\rangle \ne \eta \in Y^1_{m,n} \Rightarrow g(\eta) < \zeta$
  - (c) if $k \in [m,n)$ and $\eta \in Y^0_{k+1,n}$ then the sequence $\langle g(\eta\hat{}\langle y\rangle) : y \in Y_k\rangle$ belongs to $\mathscr{F}_{k,g(\eta)}$
- $\boxplus_3$ $\mathscr{G}^1_{m,n,\varepsilon} := \{g \in \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n} : g(\langle\rangle) = \varepsilon\}$ for $\varepsilon \le \zeta$ and $m \le n < \omega$.

Now the sets $\mathscr{G}^1_{m,n}$ are non-trivial, i.e.

$\boxplus_4$ if $m \le n$ and $\varepsilon \le \zeta$ then $\mathscr{G}^1_{m,n,\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$.

[Why? We prove it by induction on n; first if $n = m$ this is trivial. The unique function g with domain $\{<>\}$ and value ε. Next, if $m < n$ we choose $f \in \mathscr{F}_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ hence the sequence $\langle \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n-1,f(s)} : s \in Y_{n-1} \rangle$ is well defined and by the induction hypothesis each set in the sequence is non-empty. As $\mathrm{AC}_{Y_{n-1}}$ holds there is a sequence $\langle g_s : s \in Y_{n-1} \rangle$ such that $s \in Y_{n-1} \Rightarrow g_s \in \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n-1,f(s)}$. Now define g as the function with domain $Y^1_{m,n}$:

$$g(\langle\rangle) = \varepsilon$$

$$g(\langle s \rangle\hat{\ }\nu) = g_s(\nu) \text{ for } \nu \in Y^1_{m,n-1}.$$

It is easy to check that $g \in \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n,\varepsilon}$ indeed so $\boxplus_4$ holds.]

$\boxplus_5$ if $g, h \in \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n}$ and $g(\langle\rangle) < h(\langle\rangle)$ then there is an (m,n)-witness Z for (h,g) which means (just being an (m,n)-witness means we omit (d)):

- (a) $Z \subseteq Y^1_{m,n}$ is closed under initial segments, i.e. if $\eta \in Y^0_{k,n} \cap Z$ and $m \le k < \ell \le n$ then $\eta{\restriction}[\ell,n) \in Y^0_{\ell,n} \cap Z$
- (b) $\langle\rangle \in Z$
- (c) if $\eta \in Z \cap Y^0_{k+1,n}, m \le k < n$ then $\{y \in Y_k : \eta\hat{\ }\langle y \rangle \in Z\} \in D_k$
- (d) if $\eta \in Z$ then $g(\eta) < h(\eta)$.

[Why? By induction on n, similarly to the proof of $\boxplus_4$.]

$\boxplus_6$ (a) we can find $\bar{g} = \langle g_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $g_n \in \mathscr{G}^1_{0,n,\zeta}$ for $n < \omega$

(b) for $\bar{g}$ as above for $n < \omega, s \in Y_n$ let $g_{n+1,s} \in \mathscr{G}^1_{m,n}$ be defined by $g_{n+1,s}(\nu) = g_{n+1}(\langle s \rangle\hat{\ }\nu)$.

[Why? Clause (a) by $\boxplus_4$ as $\mathrm{AC}_{\aleph_0}$ holds, clause (b) is obvious by the definitions in $\boxplus_2 + \boxplus_3$.]

We fix $\bar{g}$ for the rest of the proof

$\boxplus_7$ there is $\langle\langle Z_{n,s} : s \in Y_n \rangle : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $Z_{n,s}$ witness $(g_n, g_{n+1,s})$ for $n < \omega, s \in Y_n$.

[Why? For a given $n < \omega, s \in Y_n$ we know that $g_{n+1}(\langle s \rangle) < \zeta = g_n(\langle\rangle)$ hence $Z_{n,s}$ as required exists by $\boxplus_5$. By AC_{Y_n} for each n a sequence $\langle Z_{n,s} : s \in Y_n \rangle$ as required exists, and by $\mathrm{AC}_{\aleph_0}$ we are done.]

$\boxplus_8$ $Z_n := \{\langle s \rangle\hat{\ }\nu : s \in Y_{n-1}, \nu \in Z_{n-1,s}\}$ is a $(0,n)$-witness

$\boxplus_9$ there is $\bar{F}$ such that:

- (a) $\bar{F} = \langle F_{m,n} : m < n < \omega \rangle$
- (b) $F_{m,n} : Y^1_{m+1,n} \to \mathrm{dual}(D_m)$
- (c) $F_{m,n}(\nu)$ is $\{s \in Y_m : \nu\hat{\ }\langle s \rangle \notin Z_{n-1}\}$ when $\nu \in Z_n$ and is $\emptyset$ otherwise.

[Why? Check.]

$\boxplus_{10}$ $\bar{F}$ witness $\mathrm{IND}(\langle (Y_n, D_n) : n < \omega \rangle)$ fail.

[Why? Clearly $\bar{F} = \langle F_{m,n} : m < n < \omega \rangle$ has the right form.

So toward contradiction assume $\bar{t} = \langle t_n : n < \omega \rangle \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} Y_n$ is such that

$(*)_1$ $m < n < \omega \Rightarrow t_m \notin F_{n,n}(\bar{t} \restriction (m,n])$.

Now

$(*)_2$ $\bar{t} \restriction [m,n) \in Z_n$ for $m \le n < \omega$.

[Why? By $(*)_1$ recalling $\boxtimes_9(c)$.]

$(*)_3$ $g_{n+1}(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n]) < g_n(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n))$.

[Why? Note that Z_{n,t_n} is a witness for (g_n, g_{n+1,t_n}) by $(*)_2 + \boxplus_7$. So by $\boxplus_5$ we have $\eta \in Z_{n,t_n} \Rightarrow g_{n+1,t_n}(\eta) < g_n(\eta)$. But $m < n \Rightarrow \bar{t} \restriction [m,n] \in Z_n \Rightarrow \bar{t} \restriction [m,n) \in Z_{n,t_n}$ hence $g_{n+1}(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n]) = g_{n+1,t_n}(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n)) < g_n(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n))$ as required.]

So for each $m < \omega$ the sequence $\langle g_n(\bar{t} \restriction [m,n) : n < \omega \rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of ordinals, contradiction. Hence there is no $\bar{t}$ as above, so indeed $\boxplus_{10}$ holds. But $\boxplus_{10}$ contradicts an assumption, so we are done. $\square_{3.13}$

Remark 3.16. 1) Note that in 3.13 there were no use of completeness demands except of $\aleph_1$-complete when we get rid of n^*, still natural to assume $\aleph_1$-completeness because: if D'_n is the $\aleph_1$-completion of D_n then $\text{IND}(\langle D'_n : n < \omega \rangle)$ is equivalent to $\text{IND}(D_n : n < \omega)$.
2) Recall that by [Sh:513], iff $\text{pp}(\aleph_\omega) > \aleph_{\omega_1}$ then for every $\lambda > \aleph_\omega$ for infinitely many $n < \omega$ we have $(\forall \mu_1 < \lambda)(\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_n \Rightarrow \text{pp}(\mu) \le \lambda)$.

Claim 3.17. [DC] *For* $\mathbf{x} = \langle Y_n, D_n : n < \omega \rangle$ *with each* D_n *being an* $\aleph_1$*-complete filter on* Y_n*, each of the following is a sufficient condition for* $\text{IND}(\mathbf{x})$*, letting* $Y(< n) = \prod\limits_{m<n} Y_m$

(a) • D_n *is a* $(\le (\prod\limits_{m<n} D_m)^{Y(<n)})$*-complete ultrafilter*

(b) • D_n *is a* $(\le (\prod\limits_{m<n} (D_m)^{Y(<n)})$*-complete filter*

- *for each* n *in the following game* $\Game_{\mathbf{x},n}$ *the non-empty player has a winning strategy. A play last* ω*-moves. In the* k*-th move the empty player chooses* $A_k \in D_n$ *and* $\langle X_t : t \in (\sum\limits_{m<n} D_m)^{Y(<n)} \rangle$ *a partition of* A_k *and the non-empty player chooses* $t_k \in A_k$*. In the end the non-empty player wins the play if* $\bigcap\limits_{k<\omega} X_{t_k}$ *is non-empty*

(c) *like (a) but in the second part the non-empty player instead* t_k *chooses* $S_k \subseteq (\sum\limits_{m<n} D_n)^{Y(<n)}$ *satisfying* $|S_k| \le_X |S|$ *and every* $D_{\mathbf{x},n}$ *is* $(\le S)$*-complete,* S *is infinite*

(d) *if* $m < n < \omega$ *then* D_m *is* $(\le \prod\limits_{k=m+1}^{n} Y_k)$*-complete*[2]

Proof. Straight. $\square$

---

[2] so the Y_k's are not well ordered! If $\alpha < \text{hrtg}(Y_n) \Rightarrow D$ is $|\alpha|^+$-complete then $\alpha^{Y_m}/D_n \cong \alpha$. If α is counterexample D project onto a uniform $\aleph_1$-complete filter on some $\mu \le \alpha$.

§ 3(C). **Bounds on the Depth.**

We continue 3.2. We try to get a bound for singulars of uncountable cofinality say for the depth, recalling that depth, rank and ps-T_D are closely related.

Hypothesis 3.18. *D an $\aleph_1$-complete filter on a set Y.*

Remark 3.19. Some results do not need the $\aleph_1$-completeness.

Claim 3.20. *Assume $\bar\alpha \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$.*
1) [DC] *(No-hole-Depth) If $\zeta + 1 \le \text{ps-o-Depth}^+_D(\bar\alpha)$ then for some $\bar\beta \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$, we have $\bar\beta \le \bar\alpha \mod D$ and $\zeta + 1 = \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\beta)$.*
2) In Definition 3.1 we may allow $\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon \subseteq {}^Y\text{Ord}$ such that $g \in \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon \Rightarrow g < f \mod D$.
3) If $\bar\beta \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and $\bar\alpha = \bar\beta \mod D$ then $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\alpha) = \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\beta)$.
4) If $\{y \in Y : \alpha_y = 0\} \in D^+$ then $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\alpha) = 1$.
5) Similarly for the other versions of depth from Definition 3.10.

Proof. 1) By DC without loss of generality there is no $\bar\beta <_D \bar\alpha$ such that $\zeta + 1 \le \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\beta)$. Without loss of generality $\bar\alpha$ itself fails the desired conclusion hence $\zeta + 1 < \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\beta)$. By parts (3),(4) without loss of generality $y \in Y \Rightarrow \alpha_y > 0$. As $\zeta + 1 < \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\alpha)$ there is a $<_D$-increasing sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta + 1\rangle$ with $\mathscr{F}_\varepsilon$ a non-empty subset of $\Pi\bar\alpha$. Now any $\bar\beta \in \mathscr{F}_\zeta$ is as required: $\zeta + 1 \le \text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\bar\beta)$ as witnessed by $\langle \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$, recalling part (2); contradicting the extra assumption on $\bar\alpha$ (being $<_D$-minimal such that...).
2) Let $\mathscr{F}'_\varepsilon = \{f^{[\bar\alpha]} : f \in \mathscr{F}_\varepsilon\}$ where $f^{[\bar\alpha]}(y)$ is $f(y)$ if $f(y) < \alpha_y$ and is zero otherwise.
3),4) Obvious.
5) Similarly. $\square_{3.20}$

Claim 3.21. *[DC + AC$_Y$] If $\bar\alpha, \bar\beta \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and D is a filter on Y and $y \in Y \Rightarrow |\alpha_y| = |\beta_y|$ then $\text{ps-}\mathbf{T}_D(\bar\alpha) = \text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\bar\beta)$.*

Proof. Straight. $\square$

Assuming full choice the following is a version of Galvin-Hajnal theorem.

Theorem 3.22. *[DC + AC$_Y$] Assume $\alpha(1) < \alpha(2) < \lambda^+$, $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+(\lambda) \le \lambda^{+\alpha(1)}$ and $\xi = \text{hrtg}({}^Y\alpha(2)/D)$. Then $\text{ps-o-Depth}^+_D(\lambda^{+\alpha(2)}) < \lambda^{+(\alpha(1)+\xi)}$.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda = \{\mu : \lambda^{+\alpha(1)} < \mu \le \lambda^{\alpha(1)+\xi}\}$ and for every $\mu \in \Lambda$ let

- $(*)_1$ $\mathscr{F}_\mu = \mathscr{F}(\mu) = \{f : f \in {}^Y\{\lambda^{+\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha(2)\}$ and $\mu = \text{ps-Depth}^+_D(f)\}$
- $(*)_2$ obviously $\langle \mathscr{F}_\mu : \mu \in \Lambda\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint subsets of ${}^Y\alpha(2)$ closed under equality modulo D.

By the no-hole-depth claim 3.20(1) above we have

- $(*)_3$ if $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ are from Λ and $f_{\mu_2} \in \mathscr{F}_2$ then for some $f_1 \in \mathscr{F}_{\mu_1}$ we have $f_1 < f_2 \mod D$
- $(*)_4$ $\xi > \sup\{\zeta + 1 : \mathscr{F}(\lambda^{+(\alpha+\zeta)}) \ne \emptyset\}$ implies the conclusion.

Lastly, as $\xi = \text{hrtg}({}^{Y_{\alpha(2)}}/D)$ we are done. $\square_{3.22}$

Remark 3.23. 0) Compare this with conclusion 1.10.
1) We may like to lower ξ to $\text{ps-Depth}^+_D(\alpha(2))$, toward this let

$(*)_1$ $\mathscr{F}'_\mu = \{f \in \mathscr{F}_\mu : \text{there is no } g \in \mathscr{F}_\mu \text{ such that } g < f \bmod D\}$.

By DC

$(*)_2$ if $f \in \mathscr{F}_\mu$ then there is $g \in \mathscr{F}'_\mu$ such that $g \le_D f \bmod D$.

2) Still the sequence of those $\mathscr{F}'_\mu$ are not $<_D$-increasing.

Instead of counting cardinals we can count regular cardinals.

Theorem 3.24. *[DC+AC$_Y$] The number of regular cardinals in the interval* $(\lambda^{+\alpha(1)}, \text{ps-depth}^+_{Y,\kappa)}(\lambda^{+\alpha(2)})$ *is at most* $\text{hrtg}({}^Y\alpha(2)/D)$ $\underline{\textit{when}}$*:*

- *(a)* $\alpha(1) < \alpha(2) < \lambda^+$
- *(b)* $\kappa > \aleph_0$
- *(c)* *D is a κ-complete filter on Y*
- *(d)* $\lambda^{+\alpha(1)} = \text{ps-Depth}_{(Y,\kappa)}(\lambda)$.

Proof. Straight, using the No-Hole Claim 1.12. $\square_{3.24}$

§ 3(D). Concluding Remarks.

Those are comments to [Sh:938].

Definition 3.25. We ay $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_*})$ has weak κ-true cofinality δ, omitting κ means $\kappa = \aleph_0$, if there is some witness or $(\mathbb{D}, \bar{f})$ which means:

- (a) $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \{D : D \text{ an } \kappa\text{-complete filter on } Y \text{ extending } D\}$
- (b) $D_* = \cap\{D : D \in \mathbb{D}\}$
- (c) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_{D,\alpha} : D \in bbD, \alpha < \partial\rangle$
- (d) $\langle \mathscr{F}_{D,\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ witness $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_D)$ has pseudo-true-cofinality δ.

Definition 3.26. $\delta = \text{wtcf}_\kappa(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_*})$ means $(\Pi\bar{\alpha}, <_{D_*})$ has weak κ-true cofinality δ and δ is minimal (hence a regular cardinal).

Discussion 3.27. 1) Why do not ask δ to be regular always? We may consider a sequence of δ's and as in $\text{id} - \text{cf}_\kappa(\bar{\alpha})$ in [Sh:F1078].
2) Can we $(\text{ZF} + \text{DC} + \text{AC}_{\beth_\omega})$ prove [Sh:460], using $pT_D(\bar{\alpha})$? Use [Sh:460, §1].
3) Can we generalize the proof of [Sh:824, §1] using $\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(f)$? We get λ is $\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i), \kappa < \mu$ as witnessed by $\langle \mathscr{F}^+_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$, but toward contradiction we have $D_n \in \text{Fil}^1_{\kappa_n^+}(\kappa_{n+1})$.

Remark 3.28. For $D \in \text{Fil}^1_\kappa(Y), \text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(f)$ is closely related to $\sup\{\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{D_1}(f)$. D_1 is a filter on some $\theta < \text{hrtg}(Y)$ such that $D_2 \le_{\text{RK}} D$ so natural to define $\text{ps}-\mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Definition 3.29. 1) Assume $\mathbb{D}_1$ is a set of filters and let $\text{pry}(\mathbb{D}_1)$ be

$$\begin{array}{ll}\{D_2 : & \text{for some } D_1 \in \mathbb{D}_2, \mu < \text{hrtg}(\text{Dom}(D_2)) \text{ and} \\ & h : \text{Dom}(D_1) \to \mu \text{ we have } D_2 = h(D_1)\}.\end{array}$$

2) Let $\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{D}}(\bar{\alpha}) = \sup\{\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_D(\bar{\alpha}) : D \in \mathbb{D}\}$.
3) FILL.

Claim 3.30. *Let* $\mathbb{D}_1$ *be a set of* $\aleph_1$*-complete filters,* $\mathbb{D}_2 = \text{pry}(\mathbb{D}_1)$*. Then the following cardinals are* S*-almost equivalent where* $S = \text{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(\mathbb{D}_1) = \cup\{\text{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(D_1) : D_1 \in \mathbb{D}_1\}$*:*

- (a) $\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{D}_1}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (b) $\text{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{D}_1}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (c) *FILL.*

§ 4. On RGCH with little choice

If we assume Ax_4 the answer seems yes. We like to say that just assuming DC; so if we have enough cases of IND, we use [Sh:955, §(3B)] if not, assume for every κ we have $\mathbf{p}$ more or less as in [Sh:938, 3.1], i.e. omitting the ranks such that $(\forall\lambda)\mathrm{Ax}^{\theta}_{\lambda,\mu_0,\aleph_0}$ all $D \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{p}}$ are μ_1-complete. We try to repeat.

So trying to immitate, e.g. [Sh:829] in the main case we have $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{p}}, \bar{\alpha} \in {}^{Y(\mathbf{d})}\alpha$. Without loss of generality $(\forall t \in Y_{\mathbf{d}})(\alpha_t, \mathbf{i}_1)$ is as required, using the induction hypothesis.

For $s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}}$, using $c\ell : [\alpha]^{<\mu(\mathbf{P})} \to [\alpha]^{<\mu(\mathbf{P})}$ which exists by $\mathrm{Ax}^0_\lambda, \ldots$ we have $\langle\langle f^t_{\mathbf{e},\mathbf{y},\beta} : \beta < \alpha_t\rangle : \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq \mathbf{i}_1}, \beta, \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Fil}^4_{\kappa(\mathbf{i}_1,\mathbf{p})}(D_{e_x})\rangle$ such that every: if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq \mathbf{i}_1}, s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}}, f \in {}^{Y[\mathbf{e}]}(\alpha_s)$ then for some set $\langle (y_i, \beta_i) : i < \zeta_p < \kappa(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{p})\rangle$, $\bigwedge\limits_{t \in Y_{\mathbf{e}}} \bigvee\limits_i f(s) = f_{\mathbf{e},\mathbf{y}_i,\beta_i}(s)$.

Why? Given $(\mathbf{e}, f)$ if there is no such sequence, we can find a filter $\kappa(\mathbf{i}_1,\mathbf{p})$-complete filter on $Y_{\mathbf{e}}$ such that...

But we need more: given $\bar{f} = \langle f_s : s \in Y_{\mathbf{s}}\rangle, f_s \in {}^{Y[\mathbf{e}]}\alpha_s$ and we like to consider all f_s simultaneously, say find $\langle (y_{s,i}, \beta_{s,i}) : s \in Y_s, i < i_s\rangle$ as above.

If we have $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{p}} \Rightarrow \mathrm{AC}_{Y_{\mathbf{d}}}$ this can be done. So the status of Ax^0_λ change: given $\mathbf{p}$ we say? If $(\forall x A^0_y, \ldots)$ fix. If not, then for some $\lambda(*)$ we have $\mathbf{i} < \mathrm{cf}(\mu) \Rightarrow \neg\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\lambda,\kappa(\mathbf{i},\mathbf{p}),\aleph_1}$ (can determine the other cases).

We get

$(*)_1$ if $\partial < \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ then $I = [\lambda]^{<\partial}$ and $D_n = \mathrm{dual}(I)$ then $\mathrm{IND}(\langle I, D : n\rangle)$.

Question 4.1. Can we use $\langle ([\lambda]^{\kappa(i,\mathbf{p})}, I_{\lambda,\kappa(\mathbf{i},p)}) : n < \omega\rangle$?

Can we avoid using $\langle \mathrm{AC}_{\kappa(i,\mathbf{p})} : i < \mathrm{cf}(\mu)\rangle$? Given $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}}\rangle$ we can consider $Y_* = Y_{\mathbf{d}} \times Y_{\mathbf{e}}$ and for every sequence $\mathbf{x} = \langle (\mathbf{y}_s, f_s) : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}}\rangle, f_s \in {}^{Y[\mathbf{e}]}(\alpha_s)$ let $A_{\mathbf{x}} = \{(s,t)(Y_{\mathbf{d}} \times Y_{\mathbf{e}}) : f_s(t) = f_s(t)\}$.

Now we may look at (R not too large)

$$D^* = \{Z \subseteq Y_* : \text{ there is } \langle \mathbf{x}_r : r \in P\rangle \text{ such that } Y \backslash Z \subseteq \bigcup_{r \in R} A_{\mathbf{x}_r}\}.$$

So D_R is a $\kappa_p(i_1,\mathbf{p})$-complete filter.

Let $D^*_{R,s}$ be the projection of D^*_R to $\{s\} \in Y_{\mathbf{e}}$. Clearly it is the filter defined by (α_s, f_s).

Recall [Sh:835, 2.2].

Definition 4.2. We say $\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\alpha,\delta}$ when some $c\ell$ exemplifies it which means:

- (a) $c\ell : [\alpha]^{<\kappa} \to [\alpha]^{<\mu}$
- (b) $u \subseteq c\ell(u)$
- (c) $u_1 \subseteq u_2 \Rightarrow c\ell(u_1) \subseteq c\ell(u_2)$
- (d) there is no sequence $\langle \alpha_n : n < \omega\rangle \in {}^\omega\alpha$ such that $\alpha_n \notin c\ell\{\alpha_k : k > n\}$.

Definition 4.3. We say $\mathbf{x}$ is a filter system (like [Sh:938, 3.1], add $\kappa_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{d}}, \mathrm{Rep}_{\kappa(\mathbf{d},\mathbf{p})}(D_{\mathbf{p}})$ but no rk

- (a) μ is singular

(*b*) each $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ is (or just we can compute from it) a pair $(Y, D) = (Y_{\mathbf{d}}, D_{\mathbf{d}}) = (Y[\mathbf{d}], D_{\mathbf{d}}) = (Y_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{d}}, D_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{d}})$ such that:
  (α) $\theta(Y_{\mathbf{d}}) < \mu$, on $\theta(-)$ see Definition **??**
  (β) $D_{\mathbf{d}}$ is a filter on $Y_{\mathbf{d}}$

(*c*) (α) $\kappa_\iota = \kappa_{\mathbf{p},\iota} = \kappa(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{p})$ is a cardinal $< \mu$
  (β) $i_1 < i_2 \Rightarrow \kappa_{\mathbf{p},i_1} < \kappa_{\mathbf{p},i_2}$
  (γ) $(\forall \sigma < \mu)[\exists i < \mathrm{cf}(\mu))(\sigma < kappa_{\mathbf{p},i}$
  (δ) if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq i}$ then $D_{\mathbf{d}}$ is $\kappa_{\mathbf{p},i}$-complete
  (ε) μ is strong limit

(*d*) (α) Σ is a function with domain $\mathbb{D}$ such that $\Sigma(\mathbf{d}) \subseteq \mathbb{D}$
  (β) if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbf{e} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{d})$ then $Y_{\mathbf{e}} = Y_{\mathbf{d}}$ [natural to add $D_{\mathbf{d}} \subseteq D_{\mathbf{e}}$, this is not demanded but see **??**(2)]

(*e*) (α) $\mathbf{j}$ is a function from $\mathbb{D}$ onto $\mathrm{cf}(\mu)$
  (β) let $\mathbb{D}_{\geq i} = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D} : \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{d}) \geq i\}$ and $\mathbb{D}_i = \mathbb{D}_{\geq i} \backslash \mathbb{D}_{i+1}$
  (γ) $\mathbf{e} \in \Sigma(\mathbf{d}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{e}) \geq \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{d})$

(*f*) for every $\sigma < \mu$ for some $i <$ cf(μ), if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq i}$, then $\mathbf{d}$ is $(\mathbf{p}, \leq \sigma)$-complete where

(*g*) $\mathbf{p}$ is complete when $\mathbb{D}_{\geq i} = \{(\kappa, D) : \kappa \in [\kappa_{\mathbf{p},i}, \mu), D$ a $\kappa_{\mathbf{p},i}$-complete filter on $\kappa\}$.

Definition 4.4. Let $\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\alpha,\mathbf{p}}$ means that: there is $c\ ell$ satisfying (a)-(c) of **??** as:

(*d*) if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $u \in [\alpha]^{<\mathrm{hrtg}(Y[\mathbf{d}])}$ then $|c\ell(u)| < \kappa(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{p})$.

FILL

Claim 4.5. *Assume* $\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\alpha,\mu,\leq\kappa}, D$ *a filter on* Y *and* $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y(\alpha_* + 1)$.
Then $\mathrm{ps} - 0 - \mathrm{Depth}_D(\bar{\alpha}) \leq_S 0 - \mathrm{Depth}_D(\bar{\alpha})$.
Why?

Proof. Let $c\ell$ witness $Ax^0_{\alpha_*}$, and assume $u \in [\alpha]^{<\mathrm{hrtg}(Y)} \Rightarrow c\ell(u)$. Let $\kappa = \sup\{|c\ell(u)|^+ : u \in [\alpha_*]^{<\mathrm{hrtg}(Y)}\}$. For transparency as $0 \notin \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\alpha})$, assume $\beta_* < \mathrm{ps} - 0 - \mathrm{Depth}_D(\bar{\alpha})$, so there is a sequence $\langle \mathscr{F}_\beta : \beta < \beta_* \rangle$ witnessing it so $f \in \mathbf{F}_\beta \Rightarrow f < \bar{\alpha}$.

For each $\beta < \beta_*$ so $\mathscr{F}_\beta \subseteq \Pi\bar{\alpha}, f \in \mathscr{F} := \cup\{\mathscr{F}_\beta : \beta < \beta_*\}$, there is $y \in \mathrm{Rep}_\kappa(D)$ which represents f which means:

$(*)_{f,\mathbf{y}}$ (*a*) $\mathbf{y} \equiv (Y, D, A, h)$
  (*b*) if $B \in D$ and $B \subseteq A$ then $c\ell\{f(t) : t \in \beta\} = c\ell\{f(t) : t \in A\}$
  (*c*) h is a function with domain $A_{\mathbf{y}}$ such that: $h(t) = \mathrm{otp}(f(t) \cap c\ell\{f(s) : s \in A_{\mathbf{y}}\})$ so $< \mu$
    ⊞ if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ are represented by $\mathbf{y}$ then $f_1{\restriction}A_{\mathbf{y}} = f_2{\restriction}A_{\mathbf{y}}$.

Now

⊞ $|\mathrm{Rep}_\kappa(D)| = |D \times {}^Y\kappa|$
⊞ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Rep}_\kappa(D)$ let $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{y}} = \{\beta < \beta_*$: there is $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ represented by $\mathbf{y}\}$
⊞ $\langle \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{y}} : y \in \mathrm{Rep}(D, \kappa)$ is well defined

- $\boxplus$ $\beta_* = \cup\{\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{y}} : \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Rep}(D, \kappa)$
- $\boxplus$ for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{Rep}_\kappa(D)$ and $\alpha \in \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{y}}$ let $g_{\mathbf{y},\beta}$ is the unique member of $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$ such that: if $f \in \mathscr{F}_\beta$ is represented by $\mathbf{y}$ then $g_{\mathbf{y},\beta} \restriction A_{\mathbf{y}} = f \restriction A_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $g_{\mathbf{y},\beta}(t) = 0$ for $t \in Y \backslash A_{\mathbf{y}}$
- $\boxplus$ $\langle g_{\mathbf{y},\beta} : \beta \in \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle$ is $<_D$-increasing sequence in $\Pi\bar{\alpha}$.

$\square$

Claim 4.6. *Assume D_* is a κ-complete filter on $Y, \kappa \geq \aleph_1$ and $\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\lambda,\leq\gamma,\leq\kappa}$ so γ acts as an ordinal and $\mu = \chi$ and $S = \mathrm{Fil}^4_\kappa(D_*, \gamma)$, so ∂ fixes the order type of $c\ell(\{f(s) : s \in Y\})$ and $\mathbb{D} = \{\mathrm{dual}(J[f, D]) : f \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}\}$.*

The following cardinals are S-almost equal for $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^Y\mathrm{Ord}$

- (a) $0 - \mathrm{Depth}^+_{\mathbb{D}}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (b) $\mathrm{ps} - 0 - \mathrm{Depth}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (c) $\mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{\mathbb{D}}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (d) $\cup \sup\{\mathrm{rk}_D(\bar{\alpha}) + 1 : D \in \mathbb{D}\}$.

Proof. FILL. $\square$

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbb{D}, \mu, \ldots)$ be a filter system and $(\forall alpha)(\forall^\infty, < \mathrm{cf}(\mu))(\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\lambda,\kappa_{\mathbf{p},i+1},\aleph_1})$.*

Assume further $\mathrm{AC}_{\kappa(i,\mathbf{p})}$ for $i < \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$. For $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbf{p}}$ let obey??

For every α (question: or λ?) such that $\mathrm{Ax}^0_{\alpha,\kappa(\mathbf{p}),\aleph_1}$ there is $i < \mathrm{cf}(\mu_{\mathbf{p}})$ such that: if $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq i}$ then the following as $\mathrm{Rep}_{\kappa(\bar{\mathbf{d}},\mathbf{p})}(D_{\mathbf{d}})$-almost equal

- (a) α
- (b) $0 - \mathrm{Depth}_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}(\alpha)$
- (c) $\mathrm{ps} - 0 - \mathrm{Depth}_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}(\bar{\alpha})$
- (d) $\mathrm{ps} - \mathbf{T}_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}(\alpha)$
- (e) $\mathrm{rk}_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}(\alpha)$.

Remark 4.8. 1) For (b),(c) their being almost equal we already know, see xxx.
2) Use $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbf{d}}$ or $\mathrm{rk}_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}$? Presently, rk_d.

Proof. Case 1: $\alpha < \mu$

Obvious.

Case 2: $\alpha < \mu^+$

Easy.

Case 3: $\alpha \geq \mu^+$ and for $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{Y[\mathbf{d}]}\alpha$ do we have $\alpha < \mathrm{ps} - 0 - \mathrm{Depth}(\bar{\alpha})$.

Easy by the definitions.

Case 4: as ab there are $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{Y[\mathbf{d}]}\alpha$.

Choose $\langle g^*_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \alpha \rangle$ witness $\alpha < 0 - \mathrm{Depth}^+_{D_{\mathbf{d}}}(\alpha)$ or more: such that $J[g^*_\varepsilon, D_{\mathbf{d}}]$ is constant; D_2 the dual.

For $s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}}$ clearly $\mathbf{i}(s) = \min\{i < \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$: for α_t, i is as required in the claim$\}$. Clearly $\mathbf{i}(s) < \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$ is well defined by the induction hypothesis

- $(*)$ without loss of generality for some $\mathbf{i}_0, A = \{s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} : \mathbf{i}(s) = \mathbf{i}-)\} \in D_{\mathbf{d}}$.

[Why? See Definition **??**, clause $(*)$?]

We choose $\mathbf{i}_1 \in (\mathbf{i}_0, \mathrm{cf}(\mu)))$ such that

$(*)$ FILL.

Now let $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq \mathbf{i}_1}$ and $\beta_* < 0 - \mathrm{Depth}^+(\alpha)$ and let $\langle f_\beta : \beta < \beta_* \rangle$ witness this. Define $\langle f_{\beta,s} : \beta < \beta_*, s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle$ with $f_{\beta,s}$ the function from $Y_{\mathbf{e}}$ into α_* defined by $f_{\beta,s}(t) = g_{f_\beta(t)}(s)$.

let $\langle \xi_{\beta,s} : \beta < \beta_*, s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle$ be defined by

- $\xi_{\beta,s} = \mathrm{rk}_{D_{\mathbf{e}}}(f_{\beta,s})$.

Now

$(*)$ $\xi_{\beta,s} < \alpha_s$.

Lastly, let $\langle \xi_\beta : \beta < \beta_* \rangle$ be defined by

- $\xi_\beta = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathbf{d}}(\bar{\xi}_\beta)$ where $\bar{\xi}_\beta = (\xi_{\beta,s} : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}})$.

As $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbf{d}}(\bar{\alpha} = \alpha$ and $\langle \xi_{\beta,s} : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle <_{D_{\mathbf{d}}} \bar{\alpha}$ we have

$(*)$ $\xi_\beta \leq \alpha$ (or $\xi_\beta < \alpha$).

Now for each $\xi \leq \alpha$ let

$(*)$ $u_\xi = \{\beta < \beta_* : \xi_\beta = \xi\}$.

It suffices (check formulation) to prove

$\boxplus$ $|u_\xi| < \mathrm{hrtg}(\mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(D_{\mathbf{d}}) \times \mathrm{Fil}^1_{\aleph_1}(D_{\mathbf{e}}))$.

Why? For every $\beta < \beta_*$ let $\mathbf{x}^1_\beta = (J\langle \bar{\xi}_{\beta,s} : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle, D_{\mathbf{d}}), \mathbf{x}^2_\beta = \langle J[\langle g^*_{f_{\beta,s}(t)}(s) : t \in D_{\mathbf{e}} \rangle, D_{\mathbf{e}}] : s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle, \mathbf{x}^3_\beta = J[f_\beta, D_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{x}^4_\beta = \langle J[g^*_{f_{\beta,t}}, D_{\mathbf{d}}] : t \in Y_{\mathbf{e}} \rangle.]$

Now

- if $\beta_1 < \beta_1 < \beta_*$ and $(\xi_{\beta_1}, \mathbf{x}^\ell_{\beta_1}) = (\xi_{\beta_2}, \mathbf{x}^\ell_{\beta_2})$ then $\xi_1 = \xi$.

[The delicate point: how much should $\mathbf{i}_1$ or comp($\mathbf{e}$) be above $\mathbf{d}$? or too similar to [Sh:938, §2].]

* * *

Let $J = J[\langle \xi_{\beta_\ell,1} : s \in \mathbf{d} \rangle, D_{\mathbf{d}}], J_s = J[\langle g_{f_{\beta_\ell,2(t)}}(s) : t \in D_{\mathbf{d}} \rangle]$.

First, note that as $\xi_{\beta_1} = \xi_{\beta_2}$, clearly $A = \{s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} : \xi_{\beta_{1,s}} = \xi_{\beta_2,s}\} = Y_{\mathbf{d}} \mod J$. Also for every $s \in A$ we have $B_s := \{t \in Y_{\mathbf{e}} : g_{f_{\beta_1,s}(t)}() := g_{f_{\beta,s}(t)}(s)\} = Y_{\mathbf{e}} \mod J$.

Is $\mathbf{i}_1$ large enough?

* * *

- $A_{\beta_1,\beta_2} = \{t \in Y_{\mathbf{e}} : f_{\beta_1}(t) < f_{\beta_2}(t)\} = Y_{\mathbf{e}} \mod D_{\mathbf{e}}$
- for $t \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} : A^t_{\beta_1,\beta_2} = \{s \in Y_{\mathbf{d}} : g_{f_{\beta_1}(t)}(s) < g_{f_{\beta_2}(t)}(s)\}$.

So

- $A_{\beta_1,\beta_2} = Y_{\mathbf{e}} \mod D_{\mathbf{e}}$
- $A^t_{\beta_1,\beta_2} = Y_{\mathbf{e}} \mod D_{\mathbf{d}}$ for $t \in A_{\beta_1,\beta_2}$.

As $\mathrm{hrtg}(D_{\mathbf{d}}) < \mathrm{comp}(D_{\mathbf{e}})$ by the choice of $\mathbf{i}_2$ and "$\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq \mathbf{i}_1}$", for some $A_* \in D_{\mathbf{d}}$ we have

- $B_* = \{t \in Y_{\mathbf{e}} : A^t_{\beta_1,\beta_2} = A_*\} \neq \emptyset \mod J$ where $J = J[f_{\beta_1}, D_{\mathbf{e}}] = J[f_{\beta_2}, D_{\mathbf{e}}]$.

Hence

- for every $s \in A_*, t \in B_*$ we have $g_{f_{\beta_1}(t)}(s) < g_{f_{\beta_2}(t)}(s)\}$.

$\square$

References

[Sh:b] Saharon Shelah, *Proper forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 940, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, xxix+496 pp, 1982.

[Sh:g] ______, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh:460] ______, *The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **116** (2000), 285–321, math.LO/9809200.

[Sh:497] ______, *Set Theory without choice: not everything on cofinality is possible*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **36** (1997), 81–125, A special volume dedicated to Prof. Azriel Levy. math.LO/9512227.

[Sh:513] ______, *PCF and infinite free subsets in an algebra*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **41** (2002), 321–359, math.LO/9807177.

[Sh:824] ______, *Two cardinals models with gap one revisited*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **51** (2005), 437–447, math.LO/0404149.

[Sh:829] ______, *More on the Revised GCH and the Black Box*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **140** (2006), 133–160, math.LO/0406482.

[Sh:835] ______, *PCF without choice*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **submitted**, math.LO/0510229.

[Sh:938] ______, *PCF arithmetic without and with choice*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **accepted**, 0905.3021.

[Sh:955] ______, *Pseudo pcf*, preprint.

[Sh:F1078] ______, *Pcf with narrow choice or ZF + DC +AX_4*.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`